

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. V.—No. 18.

APRIL 1929.

## THE BELLE'S STRATAGEM

By R. CROMPTON RHODES

*The Belle's Stratagem*, by Hannah Cowley, was a famous comedy in its time. Professor Porson knew it by heart, and once at a dinner-party, when another guest at the table quoted it carelessly, "the great Grecian" challenged his accuracy, and being disputed, he proceeded to recite "the fourth act, *verbatim et literatim*, until his opponent, wisely and adroitly, to the relief of the whole room, gave in." Frederick Reynolds, who tells the story in his *Life and Times* (1826), narrates this incident as occurring in 1795, when Mrs. Cowley, as the "Anna Matilda" of the *Della Cruscans*, had forsaken play-writing; but *The Belle's Stratagem* was still a favourite comedy. In 1782, when it was first published in London, *The European Magazine* described it as "a picture of modern manners, with its colours derived from the present fashion, painted with the gaiety and sprightliness of the modern stile." Its success was not merely temporary, for in the English theatre, as an acting-play, it continued to be a stock-piece for almost a century, largely because Letitia Hardy, the heroine, was regarded as a test-piece, a *personnage à faire*, for all actresses of light comedy, from Elizabeth Younge, its creator, through Dorothy Jordan, Miss Brunton, Miss Smithson (Mme. Berlioz), Madame Vestris, and others, to Ellen Terry, who last played it in London in 1881, and in Boston in 1883. To Prof. Allardyce Nicoll it appears as "an excellent comedy of manners, slightly sentimentalised."<sup>1</sup> Its present and enduring interest is that it gives a vivacious picture of fashionable life in the third quarter

<sup>1</sup> *Eighteenth Century Drama, 1750-1800*, p. 165.

of the eighteenth century. Prof. Nicoll notes "its subtle insistence in the changing conditions of the times," and this insistence was, indeed, very deliberate. In her dedication of the authorised edition to the Queen—King George the Third's Queen, Charlotte—Mrs. Cowley declared that her purpose was "to draw a Female Character, which with the most lively sensibility, fine understanding, and elegant Accomplishments, should unite that beautiful Reserve, and Delicacy which, whilst they veil those charms, render them still more interesting." *The European Magazine* replied that Letitia Hardy, the Belle, has "a lively sensibility and a fine understanding, but we never have an opportunity of discovering her beautiful reserve," adding, however, that "she is a most beautiful portrait of the fashionable female character in the present day."

## I

The stratagem which gives the play its title, is one of the many variations upon the theme of *She Stoops to Conquer*—which of course had at one time the tentative title of *The Belle's Stratagem*. But Letitia Hardy's device is double: a marriage has been arranged between her and Doricourt, who goes through the legal preliminaries with indifference. She determines upon the romantic expedient of first disgusting him with herself, by pretending to be a gawky country bumpkin; and secondly, fascinating him as the Fair Unknown of a fashionable masquerade at the Pantheon. To us it seems merely an acting part of a particularly showy effectiveness. Hazlitt, in his "Remarks" in Oxberry's edition, said:

The part of Letitia Hardy is indeed one that is expressly calculated to display the various talents and accomplishments of a young actress; it passes from the highest brilliancy of fashionable manners to the most awkward and mawkish rusticity; she dances, she sings, she romps, is grave and gay, is "every thing by turns, and nothing long;" studiously calls forth her powers both of attraction and repulsion; and by the multiplicity of changes and aspects she assumes to effect her whimsical and hazardous purpose, dazzles the audience without putting her pretensions in any one of the characters she has to sustain to the test of a severe and continued scrutiny. The texture of the character nearly resembles that of a changeable silk; and if an actress has any powers or pleasing qualities at all, it is hard but some of them will catch the light and strike the public eye under the shifting shapes and rapid evolutions which it has to undergo.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> London, 1819, pp. i-ii. Reprinted in *New Writings by William Hazlitt*, ed. P. P. Howe: 1927.

Doricourt, too, is a showy character ; when he is duly disgusted by Letitia's raw uncouthness, he, like Valentine in *Love for Love*, pretends to be mad : this was one of Sir Henry Irving's favourite acting passages as a young man. Most of the situations are the "dramatic commonplaces" of earlier authors, but the characters are of their own period. It used to be considered the duty of editors and dramatic critics to detect plagiarism in every new comedy—George Daniel, who wrote the "Remarks" in Cumberland's edition in *The British Theatre*, saw in Flutter "a thing of shreds and patches, made up of Tattle in *Love for Love*, Faddle in *The Foundling*, Sir Benjamin Backbite, and the whole host of ephemeral coxcombs that have chattered from time immemorial in comedy and farce." But these comparisons are unjust, for Flutter is exceedingly well-drawn and diverting.

## II

The edition of 1782 was authorised for the press by Mrs. Cowley, as is testified by her dedication to the Queen. But it was preceded in 1781 by an unauthorised edition and followed in 1783 by another unauthorised edition, both printed in Dublin. In one scene, the auction room, these texts differ from one another as well as from the London edition of 1782, but otherwise, except for those trivial differences which inevitably resulted from the use of different manuscripts, the three texts of the comedy are in agreement :

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1781.

The/Belle's Stratagem :/A Comedy,/of Five Acts :/as it is now performing/  
at the Theatre in Smock-Alley./

By Mrs. Cowley./

Dublin :/Printed by T. Bathe,/For the Company of Booksellers. 1781.  
12mo.

Pagination. [1] title [2] Dramatis Personæ [3], 4-77. Text. 78-79  
Epilogue 80 Blank.

No Prologue.

1782.

The/Belle's Stratagem,/A Comedy,/as acted at the/Theatre-Royal/in/  
Covent-Garden./

By Mrs. Cowley.

London :/Printed for T. Cadell,/in the Strand./1782. 8vo.

Pagination. [i] title [ii] blank [iii] Dedication To the Queen. signed

H. Cowley. [iv] *Dramatis Personæ*. [1], 2-82. Text. 83-84 Epilogue, followed by *Errata and an Advertisement of Mrs. Cowley's Dramatic Works . . . in One Volume*.

No Prologue. (The original *Prologue Spoken by Mr. Lewis* appears in the Editions of 1819, London : Oxberry, and [1825] London : Cumberland.)

1783.

*The Belle's Stratagem* ;/A/New Comedy,/ of Five Acts :/ as it is now performing/at the Theatre in Smock-Alley./

Written by Mrs. Cowley./

Dublin : /Printed in the Year, 1783.

*Pagination*. [i] *title* [ii] *blank* [iii] *Dramatis Personæ*. [iv-v] & vi *Belles Have at ye all*./Spoken as a/Prologue. [1], 2-79 *Text*. 80 *Blank* 81-2 *Epilogue*.

"Belles, have at ye all" is a parody of Mozeen's "Bucks, have at ye all," a celebrated theatrical "address."

The edition of 1782 undoubtedly established the text. However, about 1866, soon after *The Belle's Stratagem* had been performed at the St. James's Theatre, London (with "Mr. H. Irving" as Doricourt), a new version was issued which claimed to be "the first ever printed containing Mrs. Cowley's text." The publisher and editor, Thomas Hailes Lacy, asserted that a collation between his text from Mrs. Cowley's copy and the acting version would reveal "the enormity of the interpolations," and stated that the "number of alterations foisted on the authoress's play by the authorities of the theatre on its first productions are almost incredible."

A close examination of the two texts shows that the edition of 1782 adds much and alters much, and therefore provides material for an interesting study in the additions and alterations which were made at this period between the receipt of an author's MSS. at the theatre and its performance. It must be assumed that by "the authorities of the theatre," Lacy meant Thomas Harris of Covent Garden Theatre, to whose assistance many dramatists testified their appreciation. It seems to me that in revising *The Belle's Stratagem* for performances, Harris added *inter alia* (i) those patriotic sentiments which were commonly called "trap claps," because they were designed to get a round of applause, (ii) certain passages which were dictated by criticisms against *The School for Scandal* as a "social document," to use a convenient modern term.

For purposes of distinction, Lacy's edition may be described as "the author's draft" and the edition of 1782 as "the acting copy."



There are three major differences between them, the author's draft omitting (1) Act I, Scene ii (The Tradesman's Levee), (2) Act II, Scene ii (An Auction Room), and (3) Part of Act IV (The Masquerade). The third omission, as will be shown, was accidental, though Lacy did not understand it to be so.

## III

In the author's draft, Doricourt, an Englishman returned from Paris, is asked by his friend Saville :

What is the meaning of that flock of foreigners, below, with their parchment faces and their snuffs whiskers ? What, can't an Englishman stand behind your carriage, buckle your shoe, or brush your coat ?

And he replies :

Stale, my dear Saville, stale ! Englishmen make the best soldiers, citizens, artisans and philosophers in the world, but the very worst footmen.

His patriotic "sentiment" is heightened in the acting-copy by Doricourt adding : "I keep French fellows and Germans as the Romans kept slaves ; because their own countrymen had minds too enlarged and haughty to descend to such a station." This sentence is a "sentiment"<sup>1</sup> intended, like a patriotic toast at a dinner, to be greeted with a round of applause. The colloquy between them concludes in the acting copy, with another "trap-clap" :

*Doricourt.* . . . I swear to you, Saville ; the air of the Continent has not effaced one youthful prejudice or attachment.

*Saville.* With an exception to the case of Ladies and Servants.

*Doricourt.* True ; there I plead guilty : *but I have never yet found any man whom I could cordially take to my heart, and call Friend, who was not born beneath a British sky, and whose heart and manners were not truly English.*

"Patriotic sentiment had come to give that last concluding sentence," comments Prof. Nicoll, but though the ideas are inherent in Mrs. Cowley's draft, the actual "sentiment" (now italicised) is found only in the acting copy. Reynolds, writing his reminiscences forty years later, casually recalled the change that came over English comedy so speedily after *The School for Scandal*. Sheridan, he said, "despised *trap-claps*. Not a word in *The School for Scandal*

<sup>1</sup> It is usually overlooked that a "sentimental comedy" is one that abounds in sentiments or moral maxims and the like.

is to be found in praise of Laws, Jack Tars, Innocence, an Englishman's *castellum*,<sup>1</sup> or liberty." Moreover, instead of merely speaking of it, the acting-copy depicts the actual "scurvy reception" that Saville had met in Doricourt's Hall, by the foreign servants. This interpolated scene has only one English servant, the porter, whose encounter with Crowquill, "a hackney writer," satirises the "new journalism." This was lightly glanced at in *She Stoops to Conquer*, where Mrs. Hardcastle says that she takes care "to know every *tête-à-tête* in *The Scandalous Magazine*;" and in *The School for Scandal* where Mrs. Clackitt is mentioned as causing "a *tête-à-tête* in *The Town and Country Magazine* where the parties perhaps had never seen each other's faces before in the course of their lives." This magazine, founded in 1769, had as its chief feature a monthly *chronique scandaleuse*, and the added scene in *The Belle's Stratagem* showed how these libels were supposed to be concocted. Crowquill asks the Porter for some details of his master's love affairs:

*Crowquill.* Sir, you must know that I am—I am the Gentleman who writes the *tête-à-têtes* in the Magazines.

*Porter.* Oh, oh! What, you are the fellow that ties folks together, in your sixpenny cuts, that never meet anywhere else?

*Crowquill.* Oh, dear sir, excuse me! We always go on foundation; and if you can help me to a few anecdotes of your master, such as what Marchioness he lost money to, in Paris—who is his favourite Lady in town—or the name of the Girl he first made love to at College—or any incidents that happened to his Grandmother, or Great aunts—a couple will do, by way of supporters—I'll weave a web of intrigues, losses, and gallantries, between them, that shall fill four pages, procure me a dozen dinners, and you, Sir, a bottle of wine for your trouble.

#### IV

*The Belle's Stratagem* contains an animated picture of the fashionable amusement of the era, a masquerade at the Pantheon. This splendid building in Oxford Street was lavishly decorated; as in May 1772 when at the entertainment given by the noblemen of the Sçavoir Vivre Club, when it was transformed into "a romantic *paisage*, executed by Mr. Dahl of Covent Garden Theatre, with cascades, bowers, rocks, and cataracts. Transparencies were

<sup>1</sup> Referring, of course, to Dunning's famous *obiter dictum*, that an Englishman's house is his castle, which Sheridan lightly mocked in one of his early poems, "A Familiar Epistle."

disposed in other parts of the room, and every niche filled with orange and myrtle." The classical allusion to these entertainments is, of course, in *The School for Scandal*, when Sir Peter charges Lady Teazle with spending as much on "flowers in the winter to turn the Pantheon into a greenhouse and give a *Fête Champêtre* in winter." The passing mention of the Pantheon in *She Stoops to Conquer* is usually produced as "a parallel passage," but it does not seem to be known that Goldsmith himself, with Mr. Cradock, both in Old English dresses, and Sir Joshua Reynolds in a domino, attended the masquerade in May 1772.

"Society," says Sir George Touchwood in *The Belle's Stratagem*, "is a mere chaos . . . one universal masquerade, where all assume the same disguise of dress and manners." Now, this seems an absurd simile, for the essence of a masquerade was that there should be a diversity of dress, and the masques, or masqueraders, were supposed to act on "support" the character whose dress they assumed. But many masqueraders, like Sir George, refused to be "a Chinese Emperor or a Ballad-singer, a Rake or a Watchman," because, like him, they could not "trouble to support the character," and were content to wear such easy disguises as a "pink domino trimmed with blue, and a hat of the same."

But about the time of *The Belle's Stratagem*, the members of clubs giving masquerades assumed a uniform—with masks, of course. When the Kiddie's Club who met at Weltjie's in St. James' Street gave their grand entertainment in 1782 to the Prince of Wales (King George IV) at the Pantheon, the uniform "was a superb and light fancy dress of white, blue and silver, a King Harry hat, diamond buckles and feather." The cotillion was danced by a party of twelve, headed by the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Richmond. There were fifteen hundred people at the masquerade, "which blazed with the lustre of diamonds," but only a dozen characters of any sort, so that "all idea of supporting a character was soon laid aside, and promenade, enlivened by what is called *chit-chat*, filled up the whole night."<sup>1</sup> In January 1782, the Prince attended the masquerade at the King's Theatre,

but the apartments were chiefly filled with male and female dominos, chiefly black, who, having no characters to sustain, might be said, *à la Anglaise*, to enjoy a sort of *otium cum dignitate*, to the utter abolition of wit and fun, or even those sportive efforts which are found even at an English masquerade."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The European Magazine* for April 1782.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* for January 1782.

The masquerade in *The Belle's Stratagem*, however, belonged to the more animated and diversified type. But Lacy's MS. ends very abruptly after the minuet, when Doricourt says: "She dances divinely; somebody must know her! Let us enquire who she is." In the edition of 1782, there follow two excellent colloquies between Doricourt and the masked beauty (who is Letitia Hardy) before Flutter (who is always ready with false intelligence) tells his friend that she is Lord George Jennett's mistress. Hardy then comes up, and tells Doricourt that Flutter is wrong, but, the young man misunderstanding his meaning, the father promises to give him a "lesson in impatience" that will last as long as he lives. Hence, next morning, Hardy in his own house says to Villiers:

Listen to me. I hain't slept to-night for thinking of plots to plague Doricourt."

The "discovery" that the masked lady is Lord George's mistress is a link in the chain—a link without which the chain would never have been forged, and for this revelation the part of Flutter was obviously created. Since all this is omitted in Lacy's draft, where there is no next morning, the entire point is lost and a seventh of the play is swallowed up.

But otherwise, there is no reason to doubt that this was the draft submitted to Harris, just as such another of *The Runaway* was previously submitted to Garrick, who altered it similarly.

## V

After the first performance of *The School for Scandal*, there were many criticisms that the "Auction scene" was a private sale, not a public auction. There was a complaint that Sheridan had neglected his opportunities of social criticism—even forty years later, when Jesse Foot was writing his *Life of Arthur Murphy*, this complaint was repeated; he would have had the whole of the Scandalous College linked up with the middle scenes by holding a public auction of Charles's pictures which they could attend. In the author's draft of *The Belle's Stratagem*, one of the fine ladies, Mrs. Racket, mentions that she is about to attend an auction room, then a fashionable occupation, as it had been years before, when Samuel Foote wrote his comedy *Taste*. The reviser determined to show this incident in action, as he had already done with Saville's reception. But he was much less happy in his addition, for most of

it (Act II, Scene ii) is rather tedious and heavy-handed. Tom Davies, the bookseller, was not alone in wishing the scene left out entirely.<sup>1</sup> It is curious that in each of the three early editions the dialogue is entirely different. Without pressing the point, it seems to me that Silvertongue was allowed to patter or make up his own speeches after the manner of Christie or Langford, the auctioneers. Apart from giving the picture of an auction room, the point of this scene was to show Courtall making impertinent love to Lady Frances Touchwood. Silvertongue, the auctioneer, has a conversation with three "puffers"—people he employs to go among the buyers, and commend the articles that are for sale, "with the air of *Cognoscenti*." This appears in neither of the Dublin editions nor in those of later years. Next he offers for sale a model of a city in wax, upon which he moralises at once perty and tediously, and his reflections (something after the manner of the shopkeeper in Dodsley's *The Toyshop*) are not to be found in any other edition, except the Dublin edition of 1783, where, though similar in idea, they are entirely different in phraseology. On the stage, then, they must have appeared as tedious as they are now in reading—and it only shows how much better Sheridan knew his craft than the critics of his time who parroted the same complaint.

## VI

James Boaden in his *Life of Mrs. Siddons* found fault with three "slips that exact taste should point out" in the course of the dialogue which he described as "in general elegant." It is curious to discover that in each of the three instances, the "inelegancy" is to be blamed upon the acting copy, and not upon the author's draft. Boaden's instances were :

- Mrs. Racket.* Why endeavour to make him dislike you ?  
*Letitia.* Because 'tis much easier to convert a sentiment into its opposite than to transform indifference into tender passion.  
*Mrs. Racket.* That may be a good philosophy, but I'm afraid you'll find it a bad maxim.

Boaden commented—"she means a dangerous practice. The maxim cannot be bad if its philosophy be good, though to act upon

<sup>1</sup> "I could wish the auction scene were left out entirely, and the madness of Doricourt a little shortened" (*The Life of David Garrick*, by Thomas Davies, 1784.)

it may sometimes lead to disappointment." According to the acting-copy, Mrs. Cowley originally wrote :

*Mrs. Racket.* Let me see ; a quality may be changed ; but nothing cannot be changed into something. Well, that may be good philosophy, but I'm afraid you'll find it, like other philosophy, a bad practical speculation.

Again, Boaden condemned Doricourt's sentence " misfortunes always go plump to the bottom of my heart, and leave the surface unruffled," as being " a complete violation of Pope's figure " :

Self-love but serves the virtuous mind to wake,  
As the small pebble stirs the peaceful lake,  
The centre mov'd, a circle straight succeeds,  
Another still, and still another spreads.

Mrs. Cowley, however, wrote in her draft, " tho' misfortunes go plump to the bottom of my heart, yet, as when pebbles sink in water, the surface is soon unruffled."

But Boaden must have scrutinised the comedy very carefully to detect these examples, for (leaving aside the Auction Room, which satisfied nobody, and the patriotic " sentiments ") nearly all the other alterations were for the better. For instance, Harris deleted Doricourt's mad line : " Bring me a pickled elephant " ; he began the masquerade thus :

*Enter Folly on a hobby-horse, with cap and bells.*

*Villiers.* Hey ! Tom Fool, what business have you here ?

*Folly.* What, sir, affront a prince in his own dominion ?

Mrs. Cowley had placed this much later on, but by the transposition the key-note is struck at once. Mr. Hardy, Letitia's father, attends the masquerade as " Cunning little Isaac," the Jew in *The Duenna*, for whom more lines (then effective, but now pointless) were added, because Quick, the original Isaac, was the original Mr. Hardy. This is mentioned, not merely to emphasise how the reviser kept Sheridan in mind, but to notice that Mrs. Cowley, in writing the part of Hardy, disguised as the Jew, used a literary convention to express his dialect, as : " There's no depending on vhat you see—the eyes of the shellous are not to be trushted." In the printed copies, these speeches are not given as dialect, but they were always so spoken. There is an idea, expressed by Mr. M. J. Landa in *The Jew in Drama*, that the stage-Jews like Isaac Mendoza and Moses in *The School for Scandal* spoke correct English, whereas actually



they always spoke what was called "the Jewish cant"—though in point of fact, it was more closely allied to the broken English of a Dutch man, except for a Hebraic difficulty with certain sibilants. The dramatic authors rarely indicated the dialect they intended, or even that it was intended to be dialect; that part they looked upon as the business of Jewish impersonators, like Baddeley, Quick and Wewitzer.

## VII

Dr. Doran, in *Their Majesty's Servants* (1898 ed., p. 298), says that Hannah Cowley "wrote with great rapidity, and with success; for her *Runaway* brought her eight hundred pounds, and her *Belle's Stratagem* twelve hundred guineas." Where he obtained these figures I do not know, but I doubt them. The financial aspect of dramatic authorship has a direct bearing upon the publication and performance of plays in the late eighteenth century. In a recent paper,<sup>1</sup> I have pointed out that a dramatist had two sources of income—the sale of his stage-right, and the sale of his copyright. According to the custom of the time, an author had certain "benefit nights," when he received the total proceeds of the house, less a fixed amount for charges. These benefits, assuming that the play was acted nine times, were the third, sixth, and ninth nights, after which the acting-rights of the play passed entirely to the manager—providing that the play had not been printed. The highest amount that an author could receive under these conditions, was about five hundred and fifty pounds, which is roughly what Goldsmith received for *She Stoops to Conquer*, and Sheridan for *The School for Scandal*.

The first departure from this method—with the solitary exception of *The Beggar's Opera*, when Gay received a fourth benefit and possibly a fifth—was in 1789, when Reynolds received an additional benefit on the twenty-first night. This was at Covent Garden, where it established a new precedent. It was he, also, who in 1799, some years later, persuaded Harris to give him a fixed sum for each of these nights, for *Laugh When You Can*—one hundred pounds on the third, sixth, and ninth nights, fifty pounds on the fifteenth and twentieth nights, and one hundred and fifty pounds for the copyright. This established the author's receipts for a successful play as five hundred and fifty pounds. In two instances, he says, there was a different method, for Mrs. Inchbald received in 1797, eight

<sup>1</sup> *The Library*, December 1928, "Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography."

hundred pounds for her *Wives as They Were*, and Morton received, in 1803, one thousand pounds for his *Town and Country*, both previous to the first representation. There may have been other exceptions. Hazlitt, in his *Memoirs of Thomas Holcroft* (1816), wrote that "of all the pieces brought out by the author, *The Follies of a Day*, acted at Covent Garden 1784, and *The Road to Ruin* have been the most successful. He received six hundred pounds for *The Follies of a Day* at the theatre, besides a considerable sum for the copyright, which was bought in at the time." Further, "*The Road to Ruin*, acted at Covent Garden in 1792, had a run greater than almost any other piece was known to have, and there is scarcely a theatre in the kingdom, except Drury Lane and the Haymarket, in which it has not been acted numberless times.<sup>1</sup>

This perhaps is the only theatre in the three kingdoms, Drury Lane and the Opera House excepted, at which it has not been acted more probably fifty times than once. The custom of the theatres prevents its being performed in London, except at Covent Garden, where it first appeared."

The profits he received from it were nine hundred pounds from Mr. Harris, and three or four hundred for the copyright." Thus wrote Hazlitt in 1816, and the "three or four hundred" is ominously uncertain. But I would not be too certain. I have argued that the thousand pounds which Mr. Sichel says Sheridan received for *Pizarro* was made up of the proceeds of his four nights, including the twenty-first, and the sale of the copyright. I now think, with Reynolds' statement as to Morton, that Sheridan received a thousand pounds in lieu of benefits, and a further thousand pounds for the sale of the copyright. On this latter point *The Thespian Dictionary* (1802) may be cited:

*Pizarro*, tragedy, altered from Kotzebue, for the copyright of which Mr. Sheridan is said to have received one thousand pounds; it is well known that he refused eight hundred pounds, and it has since been suggested that he has published it on his own account.

But the point that must be emphasised is that an author ceased to receive any payment for his play after the ninth performance. Moreover, as soon as a play was printed, the theatre ceased to hold the exclusive right of performance, for it could then be acted by any company, without permission or payment.

In 1780, there was an agreement between Sheridan of Drury

<sup>1</sup> Holcroft's own note in his *Diary* for 1798 (August 14) reads: "Geiseveiler (called) before and after seeing *The Road to Ruin* for the first time at the Haymarket.

Lane, Harris of Covent Garden, and Colman of the Haymarket to respect each other's property. Sheridan had sold his copyright of *The Duenna* to Harris in 1775, and though it was printed in 1794, it was never acted at Drury Lane till 1809 when Kemble had succeeded Harris at Covent Garden. Accordingly, when Sheridan allowed *Pizarro* to be printed in 1799, he was surrendering his monopoly, and indeed in 1804 Kemble produced it at Covent Garden in rivalry to Drury Lane.

But even if a play was not printed, it could be acted in Ireland by anybody who could get hold of a "scrip"—or concoct one. The two Dublin editions of 1781 and 1783, derived from different MSS., both claim to be printed from the comedy "as acted at the Theatre in Smock-Alley." Richard Daly, who had seceded from Thomas Ryder's house, the Theatre Royal in Crow Street, had secretly engaged the best performers to oppose his old manager, among them his wife, formerly Miss Barsanti, the original Lydia Languish in *The Rivals* in London, the original Lady Teazle in *The School for Scandal* in Dublin. Her name appears as Letitia Hardy in both Dublin editions. Daly opened the theatre in Smock-Alley in the autumn of 1780, and in his first season he—

displayed considerable spirit and judgment—he got up the most celebrated new pieces, as soon as they were established in London, particularly *The Belle's Stratagem*, which had a considerable run and was represented with magnificence not inferior to Covent Garden.<sup>1</sup>

It was Daly's custom to purchase copies of the London plays from authors. Ryder had paid Sheridan's sister, Alicia (afterwards Mrs. Joseph Lefanu), in 1778—the first instance of an Irish manager making any payment to an author—a hundred pounds for a copy of *The School for Scandal*. Daly followed his example and purchased several of O'Keeffe's plays at this period. Among them was *The Castle of Andalusia*, which he produced in January 1782, paying a hundred pounds to O'Keeffe; at the same time sending a further gift to Harris of a hundred pounds. O'Keeffe afterwards received from Daly fifty pounds each for copies of *The Young Quaker* and *The Farmer*. No doubt other instances could be recovered, but it seems reasonable to suppose that, as it was the success of the season in London, Daly would have to pay a hundred pounds for the copy of *The Belle's Stratagem*.

<sup>1</sup> *Theatrical Dictionary*, 1802.

I suppose it must have been Daly who permitted the Company of Booksellers to print the comedy in 1781. But what about the different version printed "for the Booksellers" in 1783? Was this a piracy according to the laws of the Irish Parliament? The multiplicity of Irish editions—many of which were surreptitiously imported into England—is a great problem. It is not merely an antiquarian problem, for a considerable number of English plays in the eighteenth century, which were never printed in England, were published in Ireland. Whatever the legal position, English publishers were powerless to prevent these publications. *The Belle's Stratagem* is only one of many instances, and though there is no reason, despite Lacy, to dispossess the acting-copy from its position of authority, I have selected it to show the type of problem which besets the editor of late eighteenth-century texts.

## THE COURTIER AND THE BOOKSELLER: SOME VAGARIES OF SEVENTEENTH-CEN- TURY PUBLISHING

By W. LEE USTICK

IN 1652 James Young<sup>1</sup> published a book entitled *Arcana Aulica: or Walsingham's Manual; of Prudential Maxims, for the States-man and the Courtier*. In the address to the reader, it is stated that the MS. was obtained quite by chance, having been found upon "the taking of a small Irish Pyrate," and that it was "directed as a present unto Ormond, the Titular Vice-Roy of Ireland, from one Walsingham," who "grew up under the Wings and Favor of the Lord Digby, to [great] credit with the late King."<sup>2</sup> Walsingham, the printer further states in the address to the reader, was "able to name no Father for it;" and "whether it be some other nameless Author, as he affirms, that first gave it light, I must of necessity leave that as doubtful as I found it." The address to the reader quotes (or pretends to quote) from a letter from Walsingham to Ormond which accompanied the MS.:

It is some years since I first met with it in a Manuscript, and in a Foreign Language. . . . I have since that time found it published in Latine, but still as nameless as at our first acquaintance. The divulging

<sup>1</sup> Or was the publisher John Williams? The title-page reads: "Printed for James Yong, and are to be sold by John Williams, at the Sign of the Crown in St. Pauls Church yard." Significantly, it seems, the epistle is entitled "The Printer [sic] to the . . . Reader." James Young seems to have been a printer rather than publisher (see Plomer, H. R., *Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers . . . from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907), p. 198). It is not impossible, of course, that James Young accepted from Williams the contract for printing the book, and merely let the printing of the volume out to another printer (whence "Printed for [sic] James Yong"), rather than that he undertook the publishing of it; or Young and Williams may have been joint publishers of the book. Relation between printer and publisher ("bookseller") is often difficult to determine for seventeenth-century productions.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Walsingham, therefore, not Francis, to whom the book has at times been ascribed, possibly because in 1651 had appeared Sir Francis Walsingham's *Anatomising of Honesty, Ambition, and Fortitude*. Written in . . . 1590—a book of somewhat similar subject.

of it, seriously, I did much lament, and that for a twofold Reason; One was, to see it come abroad so lamely, and so much injured; another was, to finde it divulged at all: For surely, it is a Tract not intended for the unskilful palate of the vulgar. . . . And the most part of men are either by nature so depraved, that they cannot forbear the practise of those evils, that they finde discoursed upon, onely for their instruction; or else so sand-blinde and ignorant, that they must needs be scandalized with, and stumble at those Præcepts which are here recommended unto no mans practise, but laid by the Authors ski[l]ful hand, as necessary Sea-marks upon the Shelves of danger and deceit. . . . Surely it is done to keep us from, and not to lead us to those dangers.

Out of this arise two questions: Is it possible to identify the author of the original treatise? and wherein might the instructions there given prove dangerous to "the vulgar"? Walsingham is made to say<sup>1</sup> only that the MS. from which he made his English translation was "in a Foreign Language," and that he has "since that time found it published in *Latine*;" and he disclaims all knowledge of the authorship. It is now well known, however, that it is a translation of Eustache Du (or De) Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*, or rather, of Book II of Du Refuge's treatise. This (Books I and II) had been published in English as early as 1622 as *A Treatise of the Court . . . Done into English by John Reynolds*, which in turn was said to be from the third edition of the work in French.<sup>2</sup> Although thirty years had elapsed since the publication of Reynolds' translation, and although none of the many French or Latin editions may have had much currency in England,<sup>3</sup> it seems a little disingenuous, in 1652, to assert that the original was completely unknown and had existed only in a MS. "in a Foreign Language," especially as William Lee, the publisher of Reynolds's translation, was in 1652 still established in London as an active publisher of books,<sup>4</sup> and must have discovered the cheat imposed upon the public by James Young and John Williams in foisting upon it as *une trouvaille* part of a work that he himself had published years before. But the ways

<sup>1</sup> See the passage quoted above.

<sup>2</sup> See Du Refuge, *A Treatise of the Court*, 1622, "The French Stationer to the Reader," where it is stated that "the first Printing thereof [was] in *Holland*," and "the second in this *Citie of Paris*." In another letter from the French stationer to the reader, at the end of the "Table" of Book II, the stationer asserts: "Here I give thee the third Edition of this excellent *Treatise of the Court*." Reference, of course, is to the third *French* edition; there was only the one edition (1622) in English.

<sup>3</sup> There had been, by 1652, at least ten editions in French and three in Latin. See Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes*; Quérard, *Supercheries Littéraires Dévoilées*; and the British Museum and Harvard University catalogues.

<sup>4</sup> See Plomer, *op. cit.*, p. 115.



of booksellers, in the seventeenth century, were dark—*how* dark, we shall see presently.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, why was Edward Walsingham so concerned at the publication, even in Latin, of the treatise? Is it some dangerous bomb from the storehouse of Machiavelli, whose *Prince* Englishmen were content to peruse in the original until the middle of the seventeenth century?<sup>2</sup> Book I of *A Treatise of the Court* deals with the qualities of the courtier, and attempts an explanation of the springs of human action—a sort of anatomising of the soul. Book II, which corresponds to *Arcana Aulica* chapter by chapter, shows how the courtier is to employ these qualities in his attendance at court. It instructs him how he is to demean himself *vis-à-vis* his prince and other courtiers, if he is to gain the favour of the prince. Even more than that, as a matter of fact, it is a disjointed commentary upon princes and their practices, and thus forms, in a sort, a treatise on political science.<sup>3</sup> The usual method is to state a precept at the beginning of the chapter and illustrate it with stories from classical history and from modern—mainly the former, with Tacitus as chief source.<sup>4</sup> In a word, the treatise which Walsingham translated but would not have made public, is a work on political science and a guide for courtiers.<sup>5</sup> But although the point of view from which

<sup>1</sup> Even in 1722, it may be noted, the treatise had not been connected with that by Du Refuge, or the booksellers were still keeping up the pretence. See *Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen and Noblemen*, 1722, "To the Reader," pp. iv-vi:

"Walsingham's Manual . . . Crowns all, and is thought to be the Performance of some unfortunate Spanish Minister in his Retirement. . . . Mr. Walsingham was Secretary to the Famous Lord Digby, in King Charles the First's Time; whose Father, the Earl of Bristol, succeeding the Duke of Buckingham in his Embassy in Spain, in all Probability Purchased this incomparable Piece in Manuscript; from whose Study Mr. Walsingham is thought to have obliged the Publick with it; and it deservedly wears his Name, (for it never as yet has had any other) all the Foreign Translations in Latin, French and Italian, being extream Imperfect, Obscure and Faulty."

<sup>2</sup> Machiavelli's *Prince* was not published in English until 1640. One is tempted to hazard the guess that it was considered too dangerous or too objectionable stuff for any bookseller to risk printing it in English during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (cf. the apology of the translator, Edward Dacres, in the Epistle to the Reader, 1640).

<sup>3</sup> Why, therefore, it should have been reprinted in *Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen and Noblemen*, 1722, beside Raleigh's *Instructions to his Son* and Burleigh's *Advice to his Son*, seems somewhat dubious. The second edition of this publication of 1722, which appeared in 1728, perhaps recognised the incongruity; for it bears the more exact title: *Walsingham's Manual, or Prudential Maxims for States-men and Courtiers: with Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen and Noblemen*.

<sup>4</sup> So Sejanus figures in many chapters as a type of aspiring courtier who over-shot himself, from whom the modern courtier will take warning.

<sup>5</sup> That part of the title which describes it as a "Manual of Prudential Maxims" is slightly misleading. The book, though it offers advice, does not put it in the form of *maxims*.

this part of the book was written is entirely lacking in moral idealism, it seems scarcely so nefarious as Walsingham's qualms suggest. Its tone may be characterised as *non-moral* rather than *immoral*. Perhaps Walsingham, or whoever actually translated the treatise, *had* no qualms, but the bookseller pretended them as a wily bit of advertising. The seventeenth-century bookseller was not above tricks of his trade.

Which brings us to a second comment on the book and the practices of the book-trade, on which its publication possibly throws light. It was in 1652, it will be recalled, that Book II of Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour* was published under the title *Arcana Aulica* as a translation from the MS. of an utterly unknown "foreign" writer whose work had been published, it was admitted, in Latin. The work must have sold, for there was at least one other edition—that of 1655.<sup>1</sup> Four years later appeared a work whose address, "To the Reader," gave no hint that the book was anything other than an original composition, and promised, if it met with a cordial reception, that the author would be encouraged "to compose somewhat of another nature." It is pompously inscribed, in a Latin dedication, to "Hono[ratissi]mo Viro Johanni Fitz-James, De Leweston in Agro Durotriges (*vulgó*) Dorset-shire, *Armigero*," etc., which is dated "Ex Musæo meo, prope Bangor-howse, primo Januarii 1658. Stylo novo" and is signed "H.W." The title of the book reads: *The Accomplish'd Courtier. Consisting of Institutions and Examples. By which, Courtiers and Officers of State may Square their Transactions Prudently and in good Order and Method. . . . By H. W. Gent.* London, Printed for Thomas Dring, . . . 1658. Yet for all the new-furbished title-page, with its "H. W. Gent.," and despite the address "To the Reader" which seems to indicate H.W. was the original author of the work, it is none other than a translation—different from Walsingham's *Arcana Aulica* of 1652 and from Reynolds's *Treatise of the Court* of 1622—of Book II of Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*.<sup>2</sup>

The identity of "H. W. Gent.," who dated his dedication from his study near Bangor House in 1658, is to me an enigma. "W" of course suggests Walsingham; but what "H" stands for in that

<sup>1</sup> Or rather, 1654. Thomason redated the title-page "Nov. 9 1654." (See the copy in the Thomason Collection, Brit. Mus. E.1527.)

<sup>2</sup> That this is the case has not before, so far as I am aware, been pointed out. The British Museum, which has, in the Thomason Collection, the only copy of which I know, catalogues it *sub* W., H., Gent.

case I am unable to say. That he, rather than Edward Walsingham, was the translator of *Arcana Aulica*, 1652, and now tardily came forward to claim credit for it, is unbelievable in view of the fact that he does not allude to the earlier work. Bangor House is presumably the house so named in Shoe Lane, London, in the parish of St. Andrew's, Holborn. It had belonged to the Bishops of Bangor, but in 1647 was purchased by John (later Sir John) Barkstead. From an Act of Parliament of 1656 quoted by Strype it appears that the locality was then "dangerous and noisome to the Passengers," and it is possible that some jest is intended. But the matter is so relatively unimportant that one may rest content without knowing who H.W. was, or may even salve his conscience with the thought that it is not at all unlikely H. W. was a purely mythical personage, invented for the booksellers' purposes. The interesting thing, after all, is that only four years after the appearance of the second edition of *Arcana Aulica*, which in turn was an imposture, another version of Book II of Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour* should have come abroad, and that, not even screening itself behind references to a MS. in "a Foreign Language" or admitting the work had appeared in Latin, this new work should be set out as an original work by an English author who is given a local habitation and a suggestion, at least, of a name. It is of course possible that H. W. was genuinely unconscious of the publication of either Reynolds's translation of 1622, or of *Arcana Aulica* of 1652 and 1654, and did his work in good faith. (His translation is not a mere "crib" from either.) But if that was the case, why did he pose as the *author* of the work? His lack of candour in this respect does not predispose one to judge leniently of him. Whether Thomas Dring, the publisher, was a particularly gullible business man I do not know.<sup>2</sup> H. W. may, of course, have imposed upon him by presenting for publication as his own, a work which should have been quickly recognised as an imposture; and Dring may have swallowed the bait. Rather more likely, however, especially in view of the fact that *Arcana Aulica* had had two editions within two years, is that Dring was the offender, and sensing the possibilities of trade in a type of book which seems, strangely enough, to have been popular under the Commonwealth and the

<sup>1</sup> Stow's *London*, ed. Strype, 1720, Bk. iii, p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> Masson, in his *Life of Milton*, vi (1880), 400, 402, mentions Dring as a respectable publisher, concerned chiefly in the publication of works of real literary merit. He was joint owner of the rights of such a solid work as Stanley's *History of Philosophy*.

Protectorate, engaged an innocent translator who did actually bear the initials H. W., and in publishing the book suppressed all suggestion of its being a translation of another work. Or Dring may simply have invented the initials and the dedication to cover the deception. In any case, it is not a little strange—and it may be not uninteresting to the student of the seventeenth-century book-trade—to find that two publishers, within a period of six years, and while William Lee, the publisher of the first translation of the book, was still active in the book-trade, should have imposed upon the reading public in the manner which I have described. It seems to speak much for the trickery of seventeenth-century publishers and for the gullibility of the public.

Nor are the indications of literary taste or of political sympathies of the mid-seventeenth century without significance. So far as I know, Reynolds's translation of 1622 was never republished. But *Arcana Aulica* (1652) was reprinted in 1654;<sup>1</sup> and in the same decade, as we have seen, appeared what, though it pretended to be an original work, was but another translation of the original *Traité de la Cour*. That is, during the years when the Stuarts were most effectively cut off from their kingdom, when there was no court save such as Charles might muster at Paris or Versailles, publishers thought it worth while to put on the market at least three editions, one of them differing sharply from the first two, of a work which is no better than a guide to courtiers. That it was the Cavaliers rather than the Roundheads who bought the book, may safely be assumed. Although Charles was across the water, Englishmen had by no means ceased to dream of a kingdom once more established in England. Perhaps, when they read "Prudential Maxims, for the States-man and the Courtier," they plucked up heart—even vowed to advance the day when a Stuart should once more sit upon the throne and hold his court in England. It is too much to suppose the booksellers were consciously stimulating such thoughts; but that they were not unwilling to cater to persons of certain tastes, even of a certain political complexion, seems fairly clear.

We have seen that Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour* had gone through, besides its acknowledged translation at the hands of John Reynolds in 1622, two metamorphoses in *Arcana Aulica* (1652)

<sup>1</sup> *Arcana Aulica* was again reprinted, 1694, with Sir Robert Naunton's *Fragmenta Regalia* added, and in 1722 and 1728, respectively, in *Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen and Noblemen*, and *Walsingham's Manual*: . . . with *Instructions for Youth, Gentlemen and Noblemen*.

and *The Accomplish'd Courtier* (1658). But that is not the end of it. For some reason far from clear, Du Refuge's book seems to have lent itself to piratical translation and adaptation. We have observed two writers plundering the book, apparently confident that the theft would not be discovered. And the later seventeenth century supplies us with yet another example, though in this case the offence (if it may be termed such) is mitigated by the author's acknowledgment, at least, that he had drawn material from other books.

*The Art of Complaisance or the Means to oblige in Conversation*, London, Printed for John Starkey, . . . 1673, by an utterly unknown writer who in the Epistle Dedicatory signs himself "S. C.," is one of a type of book of manners common throughout the seventeenth century. It instructs the reader in the niceties of conduct, especially how he can be a social success, and more particularly at court. Not all of it (and here it diverges somewhat from Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*) is addressed to the courtly aspirant to favour; but the point of view, first and last, is mostly that of the courtier's manual, and in so far it shows its affinity with the French work which, as we have seen, was so productive of English adaptations.

It offers little that is original. The writer, whoever he was, frankly acknowledges his debt to other books of the sort: <sup>1</sup>

. . . I confess, that with my own observations, I have given you many remarks of the wisest persons, and greatest Courtiers, modern as well as ancient (—To the Reader).

But he has seldom cited his sources, the rather, he says, because the matters which he has borrowed have become a part of his own thought, no longer distinguishable from that of others. Yet that need not matter, for, he proceeds sagely,

If all the writers of large volumes were obliged to return what they had borrowed from others, we should see many boistrous *Folios* shrink, and hide themselves within their covers; and indeed if they could be content to do so, they would find it very difficult or impossible to distinguish their own proper thoughts or notions, amidst those various Impressions they have received from reading and Conversation (—*Idem*).

Such candour is disarming. Nevertheless, since S. C. does not divulge the sources of his book nor the degree of his indebtedness, it may be interesting to notice from what books he has drawn, and

<sup>1</sup> Of which *The Rules of Civility* (1671, by Antoine de Courtin), advertised on the page facing p. 1 of *The Art of Complaisance* as having been recently published, may be taken as type.



to what extent he is indebted to them. I have not attempted to account for every paragraph of *The Art of Complaisance*. Such an exercise, carried out to the full, would probably reveal that the author was little more than a compiler. I confess myself less interested, however, in running down each source than in noticing the general way in which *The Art of Complaisance* was put together. To find an idea or a peculiarity of expression recurring from book to book has undeniably a certain interest; but wholesale appropriation of material from one source, to be combined with materials from other sources in such a way as to form a work which is an entity and yet is a sort of crazy quilt, seems to me still more important, because it suggests how books were not infrequently made in a generation that apparently knew not plagiarism as a cardinal sin. I shall limit myself, therefore, to pointing out the main sources of *The Art of Complaisance*.

Ten of the sixteen chapters are mere translations of passages in Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*.<sup>1</sup> S. C., in presenting the material from Du Refuge's book (which he does not name), occasionally omits a brief passage from the *Traité de la Cour*, or adds a passage.<sup>2</sup> But page after page of *The Art of Complaisance* is merely a translation of Du Refuge's book, paragraph by paragraph and sentence by sentence.<sup>3</sup> Although S. C. has contented himself with a literal translation of sections from the *Traité de la Cour*, he has selected those sections with some care and has freely varied the order of the borrowed portions to suit his own purposes. The *Traité de la Cour* was frankly a manual for courtiers. *The Art of Complaisance*, while it does not avoid the needs of the courtier and his art, plainly addresses itself to other readers besides the aspirant to court favour. Consequently it extracts from the French manual only such passages as are adaptable to the more general scope of a work on conduct which is not specifically for the courtier. The *Traité de la Cour* contains two Books with a total of seventy-nine chapters. Of these

<sup>1</sup> The point, so far as I am aware, has not before been noted.

<sup>2</sup> As at pp. 71-72, 75-76, 81-82, where he quotes (with acknowledgment) from *Epictetus Junior*, 1670 [by John Davies of Kidwelly], and at pp. 138-141, where he quotes (again with acknowledgment) from Della Casa's *Arts of Grandeur and Submission* (English translation, 1665).

<sup>3</sup> The other parts of *The Art of Complaisance* are, if not mere translation of, at least in large part adaptations from, other books on similar subjects: Della Casa's *Galateo* or some translation or imitation of it, Courtin's *Rules of Civility* (itself largely reminiscent of the *Galateo*, as indeed the *Traité de la Cour* is also), and similar works.



S. C. has utilised, in whole or in part, eighteen, sometimes reproducing as a chapter in his book what was a chapter in the other, at other times combining all or parts of as many as four chapters of the French book to form a single chapter of his.<sup>1</sup> Unlike the translators of *Arcana Aulica* and *The Accomplish'd Courtier*, he has used the material with complete freedom. Whereas they translate the whole of a single book of the *Traité de la Cour* (Book II) and omit entirely Book I, S. C. has drawn now from one part of the work, now from another, by no means cramping himself to the original order in which the chapters were set down. And between he has strewn his other borrowings and whatever of original he had to offer. It is perhaps not inaccurate to say that *The Art of Complaissance* is built not merely of the bricks and mortar of the *Traité de la Cour*, but that entire portions of the edifice have been taken over intact, and have been combined with other materials to form a structure which is largely recognisable as Du Refuge's work, but metamorphosed into something new and in itself complete.<sup>2</sup>

Although, after this analysis of *The Art of Complaissance*, S. C. may seem to stand condemned of a grave offence in pretending he has merely got some of his ideas from others, whereas the fact is he has resorted to sheer *translation* from another book for about three-fourths of his own, my purpose in the foregoing pages has not

<sup>1</sup> Specifically,

<i>The Art of Complaissance</i> , Chap. II	=	Bk. I, Chap. XXXV of the <i>Traité de la</i>
" " " III	=	" I " XXXVI " " [Cour
" " " IV	=	" I " XXXVII-XXXVIII " "
" " " V	=	" I " II-V " " "
" " " IX	=	" I " XXXIV " " "
" " " X	=	" II " IV-VII " " "
" " " XI	=	" II " X-XI " " "
" " " XIV	=	" I " XXVI " " "
" " " XV	=	" I " XXVII " " "
" " " XVI	=	" I " XXVIII " " "

<sup>2</sup> Although I think there is little in *The Art of Complaissance* which originated with its author, an occasional passage gives the impression of not having been lifted bodily from some other work. Such a passage is:

"How deplorable a thing is it! that a man who wants wit to paint the true image of virtue, should be suffer'd to make the Stage the seat of Atheism, & the throne of all impiety, by giving the publick only a representation of a filthy life, & a debauched conversation! they are not to be esteemed much more Impudent, and regardless of the honour of this renowned Kingdom, who say they write to please the Humour of the age, as if nothing could be agreeable to us, but the seeing the most horrid vices of the most wretched of men, render'd amiable under the name of virtues, and by discourses full of rottenness and bawdery" (pp. 65-66).

S. C. seems here, plainly, to express an English rather than a French reaction to the comedy of manners. It is interesting to find, in the time of Charles II, one who, while interested in courtly behaviour and the life of the court, disapproved strongly of the bawdy plays of the period.

been primarily to prove that he was guilty of what we in our day should regard as gross plagiarism, or even to discover the sources from which he drew his material. In the first place, condemnation of plagiarism was by no means so severe in the seventeenth century as it is now; and as it is in the light of contemporary opinion that an author must be judged in such matters, there need be no question here of our tracking down an offender and setting him in the pillory.<sup>1</sup> In the second place, merely showing where a writer has obtained his every idea, though a game of undeniable fascination, does not seem to me of cardinal importance. What does, however, seem to me of importance is ascertaining the widespread effect a given book may have exerted upon its own and succeeding generations. And in the *Traité de la Cour* and its English versions we have a capital illustration. Not only, as we have seen from our study of *Arcana Aulica* (1652) and *The Accomplish'd Courtier* (1658), was the book (at least one complete section of it) translated into English and issued without acknowledgment of source; in *The Art of Complaisance* large portions of it were excerpted and combined with other material, to form a work which is essentially of Du Refuge's workmanship and yet is more than a mere translation. Of editions in other languages the *Traité de la Cour* had by 1673 had many: at least thirteen in French, four in Latin, one in German.<sup>2</sup> It was one of those books which the booksellers were ever and again throwing upon the market, in one form or another. And that is but another way of asserting the popularity, and hence presumably the influence, of the book.

But how it was possible that the work, obviously popular and well known, should in England have been able to parade under so many false masks, is a question I cannot with assurance answer. In the case of *Arcana Aulica*, the first disguised version of the book, one can perhaps explain it by pointing out that from 1622, when John Reynolds published his translation (*A Treatise of the Court*), to 1652, there had been published, so far as one knows, no English version of Du Refuge's book, and that consequently the work must by 1652

<sup>1</sup> That earnest voices were, even early in the seventeenth century, however, raised against plagiarism, appears from such an unequivocal pronouncement as the following (from Junius, R. [i.e. Richard Younger], *The Drunkard's Character*, 1638, The Epistle Dedicatory):

"I see many make use of your lines, few acknowledge, none return to give thanks; but no cheating, like the felony of wit; for hee which theeves that, robs the owner, and coosens all that heare him."

<sup>2</sup> See Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes*, vol. iv (1879), Quérard *Supercherie Littéraires Dévoilées*, vol. ii (1870), and the British Museum Catalogue.

have been relatively unknown to readers who read only English. But *Arcana Aulica* was reprinted in 1654; in other words, at least the first edition had found readers. How explain, then, the appearance of *The Accomplish'd Courtier* in 1658, published as though it were an original English work, only a few years after the two editions of *Arcana Aulica*? How explain, moreover, the fact that *The Art of Complaisance*, of 1673, was little more than a translation of some of the more striking parts of the original of all these books, and yet apparently aspired to pass as something new, and succeeded at least sufficiently to require a second printing?<sup>1</sup> And finally, how explain the secrecy maintained about the authorship of the first of these piratical versions, even in 1694, 1722, and 1728, when it was reprinted yet other times?<sup>2</sup> Englishmen were not so ignorant of French literature, in the seventeenth century, that a work as popular throughout Europe as the *Traité de la Cour* should have remained to them unknown. Many of them must have recognised, in *Arcana Aulica*, and *The Accomplish'd Courtier*, and *The Art of Complaisance* the work of Du Refuge, even though the booksellers went on throwing dust in the eyes of the reading public. Yet the works continued to come tumbling from the presses.<sup>3</sup>

These questions need not, perhaps, be answered. But one thing at least is clear: England of the second half of the seventeenth century and of the early eighteenth was a receptive buyer of books on political science and conduct in courtly circles—quite as much so, we have seen, under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate as after the Restoration. As an index of popular taste this series of books based upon the *Traité de la Cour* is assuredly significant, whatever one may think about the reasons which induced different

<sup>1</sup> The second edition was published in 1677.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 145, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> An interesting commentary upon the apparent success with which Du Refuge's book could be made to pass as something else, even in its original language, is furnished by two versions of Walsingham's *Arcana Aulica* (i.e. Bk. II of Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*) which were published on the Continent in French translation of the English. *Le Secret des Cours, ou le Journal de Walsingham*, published in Cologne in 1695, is, according to the British Museum Catalogue, nothing less than a French version of Walsingham's translation of the second part of Du Refuge's book. Again, the middle section of Sir D. Digges' *Mémoires et Instructions pour les Ambassadeurs*, Amsterdam, 1700, is (if the Boston Athenæum Catalogue is correct) a French translation of Walsingham's *Arcana Aulica*. It is true that these versions, though French, were not published in France. Nevertheless the metamorphosis, by translation, of Du Refuge's *Traité de la Cour*, Bk. II, into Walsingham's *Arcana Aulica*, and its double reincarnation in its original language through the intermediary of this English translation, is something to make one rub one's eyes.

booksellers to impose upon the public with different versions of the same work. And finally, the mere fact that several booksellers should have practised the same kind of deception with identical material gives more than a suggestion of the business ethics, in the later seventeenth century, of even such staunch booksellers as Thomas Dring and John Starkey.

Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.

W  
wo  
fro  
TH  
on  
TH  
we  
dif  
wo  
is  
vo  
an  
of  
te  
ar  
an  
m  
to  
ap  
er  
  
of  
of  
ti  
a  
"  
M  
or  
m

## THE ERRATA IN THE TATLER

By F. W. BATESON

### I

WHEN *The Tatler* of Addison and Steele first burst upon a delighted world in the April of 1709 it was not very different in appearance from the rabble of newspapers of the time. Like *The Daily Courant*, *The Observator* and *The Flying Post*, it was printed in double columns on both sides of a single folio sheet of paper; and it came out, like *The Evening Post*, *The Post Boy* and *The Review*, three times a week—on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays. If there was any difference it was that *The Tatler* was more carelessly printed and on worse paper than its less literary rivals. *The Tatler*, as we know it, is descended from the octavo and duodecimo editions in four volumes of 1710 and 1711. The differences between these editions and the original tri-weekly sheets are not limited to the differences of appearance. There were also omissions and corrections of the text. For one thing, most of the short paragraphs of news, which are so conspicuous in the folio edition, were not reprinted. For another thing, all the advertisements, including some of the clever mock-advertisements, were removed. A third difference, and one to which very little attention has been paid hitherto, was the disappearance of the numerous and characteristic lists of printer's errors.

The lists of these "*Errata*" are spread over as many as thirty-six of the original numbers. They are all highly individual. Instead of the formal tabulation of misprints which was customary at the time, the corrections take the form, with some exceptions, almost of a confidential apology. The tendency is to preserve the intimate "button-holing" tone of the essays, and it is not uncommon for Mr. Bickerstaff himself to be introduced in *propria persona*. In one paper he is informing the reader that he is "*much taken up with my Astronomical Observations*," and therefore unable to "*attend the*

*Press so carefully as I ought."*<sup>1</sup> In a later number he confesses to "a shaking Hand" :—

*I must desire my Readers to help me out from Time to Time in the Correction of these my Essays ; for as a shaking Hand does not always write legibly, the Press sometimes prints one Word for another ; and when my Paper is to be revised, I am perhaps so busy in observing the Spots of the Moon, that I have not Time to find out the Errata that are crept into my Lucubrations. Among several in my last Paper, be pleased to read each for this in the 20th Line of the last Column.*<sup>2</sup>

A month or two afterwards he is confiding to the inquisitive "that I always make Use of an old-fashioned e, which very little differs from an o," an even then almost obsolete practice which he mentions to excuse such misprints as "those for these, beheld for behold, Corvix for Cervix, and the like."<sup>3</sup> Or a bibliographical point may be raised. It is clear, for example, from the following notice that there was occasionally more than one impression of a single issue—a detail that has so far been overlooked :—

*The last Paper having been worked off in different Presses, there are some Errata in one Set of them, which the Reader is desired to correct : Col. 1. Line 46. for in the Latitude of 13, read in the Latitude of 73. Col. 2. L. 49. for I, read he ; Col. 3, Line 52. for teur, read tuer.*<sup>4</sup>

Another peculiarity of these *errata* is that, instead of being confined to printers' errors, they often embody revisions of a kind which should have been made in the manuscript or the proof. Sometimes it is the grammar which is being improved upon, and "is" is substituted for "are," "their" for "its," "hath hindered" for "have hindered."<sup>5</sup> Sometimes a mistake of fact is corrected.

<sup>1</sup> No. 78.

<sup>2</sup> No. 101.

<sup>3</sup> No. 131.

<sup>4</sup> No. 255. Actually both of the impressions print "in the Latitude of 13." There are differences, however, in the use of stops and capitals which were not noted in the *errata*. The precise relationship of the two impressions is a problem in itself. The fact that the line-divisions in the last 30 or 40 lines are identical in both suggests that they emanate from the same printing house, but the differences in the earlier paragraphs are too marked to permit the assumption that either of the versions is a reprint of the other. I suggest tentatively that they were set up simultaneously by two compositors working side by side but at different speeds. The slower worker, while compelled to devise his own line-divisions for the bulk of the paper, would thus have been at liberty to follow his colleague in the concluding section. The collected edition of 1711 was reprinted from the "Set" reading "tuer" in l. 52. Why it should have been necessary to print two impressions at the same time is not immediately obvious. Perhaps the MS. had been delayed and there was not time to produce the customary number of copies with a single press.

<sup>5</sup> Nos. 158, 155, 105.



In the essay for December 27, 1709, as it originally appeared, it was Epaminondas, instead of Agesilaus, who used to ride on a hobby-horse with his children. Or it may be a quotation which has been made from memory. Rochester's epigram,

The best good Man, with the worst-natured Muse,

as it first appeared in No. 242, had been distorted into

The best good Man, and most ill-natured Muse ;

an *amende honorable* was printed in the next number. More often, however, the corrections are stylistic. The reader is perpetually being requested to change "Method" to "Expression," or "tastes" to "relishes," or "not so much because" to "not only because."<sup>1</sup> Other not less nice readjustments of expression include the substitution of "great Antiquity" for "very ancient Extraction," "Generality" for "greater Number," "Ages" for "Times."<sup>2</sup> In one paper a clause is to be deleted ;<sup>3</sup> in another a whole sentence is to be inserted at discretion :—

*about the Conduct of our Family in their Marriages, put in where you think best, It is to be noted, That the Women of our Family never change their Name. This last Amendment must be made, or we have writ Nonsense.*<sup>4</sup>

The emendation, in this last case, was perhaps not intended to be taken very seriously. There is a disarming liberality about the "*where you think best*," which is only equalled by a correction in the preceding number where the reader is informed that "fawning as a Lap-dog" was a misprint for "fond as an Alderman." Evidently Mr. Bickerstaff was not incapable of pulling his public's leg.

From the preceding quotations it will be observed that the *errata* in *The Tatler* are of two kinds. There are the simple corrections of misprints, omissions and mistakes of grammar and matter of fact ; and there are also the alterations which seem to have been dictated merely by motives of style. The importance of the former is limited to their intrinsic interest as literary curiosities. The latter, however, have an additional interest which it is the object of this article to emphasise. This is the curious fact that they are almost confined to essays which are known to be partially or wholly by Addison. To be precise, the *errata* embodying stylistic corrections are distributed altogether over seventeen numbers of *The Tatler*, eleven

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 115, 118, 105.

<sup>2</sup> Nos. 223, 158, 118.

<sup>3</sup> No. 155.

<sup>4</sup> No. 79.

of which are by Addison. The figures are not very impressive in themselves, but they become much more so when it is remembered that Addison's known share in the paper was only a fifth of the total number of essays. With that fact in mind it is no longer unreasonable to stress the connexion between these *errata* and Addison's authorship of the numbers to which they refer. Moreover, there is nothing in the hypothesis which is inconsistent with what is known of Addison's habits of composition. The tradition is that he was painfully conscientious in revising and correcting everything he wrote. "Mr. Addison," Pope once remarked to Spence, "would never alter any thing after a poem was once printed; and was ready to alter almost every thing that was found fault with before.—I believe he did not leave a word unchanged, that I made any scruple against in his *Cato*."<sup>1</sup> And on another occasion he told Spence, "Mr. Addison wrote very fluently: but he was sometimes very slow and scrupulous in correcting. He would show his verses to several friends; and would alter almost every thing that any of them hinted at as wrong. He seemed to be too diffident of himself; and too much concerned about his character as a poet: or (as he worded it) too solicitous for that kind of praise, which, God knows, is but a very little matter after all."<sup>2</sup> A further confirmation is provided by Joseph Warton's statement that "Addison was so extremely nice in polishing his prose compositions, that when almost a whole impression of a *Spectator* was worked off, he would stop the press to insert a new preposition or conjunction."<sup>3</sup> It must be clear that a writer of this character would be extremely likely to make the minute and often trivial changes which many of the *errata* in *The Tatler* exhibit.<sup>4</sup>

A difficulty still remains. It has been said that there are seventeen numbers in which stylistic corrections are made, eleven of which are by Addison. Who then, it may be asked, was responsible for the six numbers which are not by him? The answer has generally been that they are Steele's, apparently on the principle that whatever is not known to be by somebody else must be by Steele. I hope to show the weakness of that assumption and to give very

<sup>1</sup> *Anecdotes, Observations, and Characters*, ed. S. W. Singer, 1820, p. 151.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>3</sup> *An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*, 2 vols., 1782, i. p. 152.

<sup>4</sup> Addison's connexion with the *errata* was first pointed out by John Calder, who was the real editor of the six-volume *Tatler* of 1786 and the revised four-volume edition of 1789, which are usually ascribed to John Nichols.

good reasons for believing that all the essays involving corrections of style, except one, are by Addison. The first step will be to inquire into the reliability of the traditional ascriptions of authorship in *The Tatler*.

## II

In *The Spectator* Addison was careful to have his contributions marked with one of the letters, C, L, I, O, and in *The Guardian* (the collected edition of 1714) with a symbol representing a hand. It was different in *The Tatler*. When Steele wound the paper up in No. 271 he promised to supply "a faithful Index and Explication of Passages and Allusions, and sometimes of Persons, intended in the several scattered Parts of the Work. At the same Time the succeeding Volumes shall discover which of the whole have been written by me, and which by others, and by whom, as far as I am able, or permitted." The promise, it goes without saying, was not kept. All that Steele did was to pay Addison (but not by name) some handsome compliments in a preface to the fourth volume of the collected edition, and to point out four of his contributions, "*the distinguishing Characters of Men and Women under the Names of Musical Instruments, the Distress of the News-Writers, the Inventory of the Play-house, and the Description of the Thermometer,*" i.e. 157, 18, 42, and 220. And that, for several years, was all that the public knew or, in Steele's opinion, needed to know about Addison's share in *The Tatler*. As a matter of fact considerably more than this is known now, but for the knowledge we have to thank Addison himself rather than Steele. The collected edition of his writings, which was actually published by Tickell, his literary executor, in 1721, was planned by Addison shortly before he died, and it was then decided to include in it the contributions to *The Tatler*. Addison was too ill at the time to identify the essays himself, and therefore instructed Tickell to apply to Steele, and a list which Steele eventually and grudgingly supplied<sup>1</sup> formed the basis of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Steele's angry letter to Tonson which is printed by Aitken (*Life*, ii. p. 216): "I apprehend certain Persons desire to separate the works of Mr. Addison from mine in a Book called the Tatler. Be pleased to observe that I insist I paid Mr. Addison for what he writ under that title, and made a Title of the whole to Nutt, and as there is a remainder according to act of Parliament in Writings to authors of which my Family shall not be bereft, Mr. Addison is the last man who shall be patiently suffer'd in doing unreasonable things (that He has you must know)." The letter is dated July 19, 1719. Addison had died in the preceding month.

*The Tatler* portion of Tickell's edition. These pages, and Steele's earlier preface, are our only authorities for distinguishing Addison's part in *The Tatler*. Altogether Tickell attributed 62 papers, in whole or in part, to Addison, 42 being entirely Addison's and the remaining 20 being either collaborations with Steele or shorter contributions, not large enough to make up a whole issue by themselves, to which Steele had prefixed or added something of his own. So far as it goes the list is probably accurate (there is no internal evidence with which it clashes); but it is certainly incomplete. There is a *prima facie* improbability, remembering Addison's acknowledged facility and the proportion of his essays to Steele's in *The Spectator* and *The Guardian*, that only a fifth of the whole of *The Tatler* should be his. A more decisive point is that two papers are attributed to Addison in Steele's preface (to the fourth volume of the collected *Tatler* of 1711) which are not in Tickell.<sup>1</sup> If two out of the four essays which we know to be Addison's and which Steele had himself described as "*the greatest Embellishments of this Work*" were overlooked, is there not a very strong presumption that others, not less certainly his, have also been omitted?<sup>2</sup>

The assumption, as it happens, is strikingly confirmed by the evidence which is provided by the *errata*. In the first place, *The Spectator* is also characterised by *errata* similar in kind to those in *The Tatler*; but whereas the proportion of misprints and omissions is much the same as in *The Tatler*, the proportion of stylistic corrections is considerably higher.<sup>3</sup> If Addison had marked his essays

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 18 and 157.

<sup>2</sup> All the editors, except Hurd, have proceeded upon this assumption. In Tickell's edition of Addison 42 numbers are marked as Addison's alone and 20 more as collaborations with Steele. The list was reprinted without additions in Hurd's 6-volume edition of Addison in 1811. Calder, however, had added 24 more in his editions of *The Tatler*, the majority being assigned with varying degrees of confidence to Addison alone. Nathan Drake (*Essays Illustrative of the Tatler, Spectator, and Guardian*, 3 vols., 1805, iii. p. 376) reduced the total to 78, including 36 collaborations with Steele. He is followed by G. A. Aitken (*Life of Richard Steele*, 2 vols., 1889, i. p. 248; and *The Tatler*, 4 vols., 1898, preface, p. xiv), though in Aitken's edition of *The Tatler* 46 essays are assigned to Addison alone and only 21 to Addison and Steele together. J. G. Ames (*The English Literary Periodical*, 1904, p. 53) attributes 75 numbers to Addison, including 34 in collaboration with Steele. These figures are also given by H. Routh (*Cambridge History of English Literature*, ix. p. 47) and G. S. Marr (*Periodical Essayists of the Eighteenth Century*, 1924, p. 24). Finally, C. N. Greenough (P.M.L.A., xxxi, No. xxiii, December 1916) has assigned 84 numbers, in part or in whole, to Addison. It is not too much to say that every one of these lists, including Tickell's, is demonstrably wrong.

<sup>3</sup> The misprints, etc., cover 37 numbers, of which 23 are Addison's, 13 Steele's, 1 Budgell's. The stylistic corrections are confined to 21 numbers, of which

in *The Tatler* himself, is it not probable that the proportion of stylistic corrections would be approximately the same in both cases? In the second place, the periods of Addison's residence in London coincide to a surprising degree with the periods when the notices of *errata* (of all kinds) were appearing in *The Tatler*. Addison arrived in Dublin shortly before the first number came out, and did not return to England until the end of September 1709; three issues containing *errata* appeared in his absence. He remained in London until the end of April 1710, and twenty-three lists of *errata* were published in these seven months. He was not back in London until the middle of August, but not a single *erratum* appeared this time while he was away. From the date of his return until the paper was wound up at the end of the year there were ten more *errata* notices. In other words, though Addison was out of London during something like half the paper's life, only three out of the thirty-six issues which contain *errata* were published in his absence. The long arm of coincidence will not explain this discrepancy away. There can be no doubt that it was Addison who was primarily responsible for the appearance of *errata* in *The Tatler*. But in that case is it not reasonable to infer that he was the author of more of the essays to which the *errata* refer than it has been customary to admit?

It may be conceded that the presence of corrections, however elaborate or gratuitous, is not a proof of Addison's authorship of the essays in which they occur. In combination with other evidence it may be conclusive; alone it can only suggest a probability. There is a presumption that the papers which contain alterations will be his; but there is also the presumption that the papers omitted in the list Steele sent to Tickell will *not* be his. It is a question of the balancing of probabilities. If there were no other evidence available would an editor still be justified in assigning to Addison all the essays, whether included by Tickell or not, which embody stylistic corrections?

As it happens the dilemma need not be faced. Other evidence is available, and if it is not always very important in itself it is at

Addison was responsible for 19 and Steele for 2. Addison and Steele took an approximately equal share in *The Spectator*. In *The Guardian* the *errata* are so few and far between that they are not of much significance. I give the figures for the sake of completeness. The misprints are limited to 9 numbers, 3 by Addison; the stylistic corrections to 3, 2 by Addison. Of the 175 papers, 51 were written by Addison.



least sufficient for our purposes. In the first place, there is the evidence of topic. Certain subjects appealed to Addison which did not appeal to Steele; an example is the allegorical dream or "Vision."<sup>1</sup> There were certain prejudices which they did not both share, or at any rate not to the same extent, *e.g.* Addison's antipathy to the Royal Society,<sup>2</sup> or Steele's objections to duelling.<sup>3</sup> Finally, they both had their favourite authors, to be mentioned, to be quoted, to be imitated, and they were not always the same.<sup>4</sup> In the second place, there is the evidence of diction. In his *Essays in Biography* Mr. Bonamy Dobrée has recently pointed out the curious fascination which the word "secret" exercised upon Addison. "The word," he remarks, "is frequently used quite gratuitously, or at best as padding to eke out the failing balance of a sentence; it is hardly ever necessary, sometimes it is tautological, often it is entirely meaningless," and he goes on to show that "the adjective nearly always goes with expressions of gratification, as though the ideas were definitely associated."<sup>5</sup> Phrases like "secret Joy," "secret Pleasure," "secret Satisfaction," "secret Pride," "secret Approbation," are certainly extraordinarily common in Addison's essays;<sup>6</sup> Steele hardly uses them at all.<sup>7</sup> A more serviceable criterion, which has not, I think, hitherto been noticed, is provided by the different uses which Addison and Steele make of the relative pronouns. In Addison's writings all the relatives ("who," "whom," "whose," "which," "what," "that") are frequently employed, and "that" is especially common. (In revising *The Spectator* for the 12<sup>o</sup> edition of 1714, Addison seems to have come to the conclusion that he had used "that" too often and accordingly changed it in many

<sup>1</sup> *E.g. The Tatler*, Nos. 81, 100, 102, 146, 161; *The Spectator*, Nos. iii, lxxxiii, clix, cxliiii. Steele's only "Vision" seems to be No. dxiv of *The Spectator*.

<sup>2</sup> Addison's views on the Royal Society will be found in *The Tatler*, Nos. 119, 216; and *The Spectator*, No. cxli. It should be added that Steele also was not above poking fun at the Royal Society.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *The Tatler*, Nos. 28, 31, 39; *The Spectator*, Nos. lxxxiv, xcvi; *The Theatre*, March 5, 1720; *The Conscious Lovers*, preface.

<sup>4</sup> Locke was a favourite of Addison's. The essays in *The Spectator* on true and false wit and the pleasures of the imagination are not much more than paraphrases of some passages in *The Human Understanding*. Steele appears only to have known Locke at second hand.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 259-260.

<sup>6</sup> "Secret Pleasure," *Tatler*, 81; *Spectator*, iii, cclxxxviii, ccclxiii; "secret Joy," *Spectator*, cviii, cclxix, cxi; "secret Satisfaction," *Spectator*, lxix, dlvii; "secret Pride," *Spectator*, dliv; "secret Approbation," *Spectator*, cccclxxxi.

<sup>7</sup> Dobrée has noted a similar use of "secret" in Berkeley and Defoe. Was it a deliberate imitation of Addison?

places to "which." <sup>1</sup>) Steele, on the other hand, is much more sparing in his employment of relatives, and indeed hardly uses "that" at all. To be precise, Addison has an average in every thousand words of 24 relatives of which 6 are "that," whereas Steele has 15 of which only 2 are "that." <sup>2</sup> The point, however, is not so much the differences indicated by these figures as the consistency with which these averages are maintained. In all the essays which were examined Steele never once reached Addison's average, or anything approaching it, and Addison never dropped to Steele's. <sup>3</sup> It may therefore be expected that any essay which contains as many, or rather more, relatives per thousand words than was Addison's norm will not be by Steele, and *vice versa* that any with about, or less than, Steele's average will not be by Addison. The doubtful cases will be those which fall halfway between the two. <sup>4</sup>

## III

There are seventeen numbers of *The Tatler* in which corrections that can be called stylistic occur, <sup>5</sup> and ten of them are in Tickell, while an eleventh, No. 157, had been assigned to Addison in Steele's preface of 1711. The six which remain are Nos. 36, 104, 151, 221, 222, and 227. I have recently examined these essays in detail, applying all the tests, internal or external, which would confirm or refute the presumption of Addison's authorship which was provided by the *errata*. The result has been to convince me that they are all, with the exception of 36, <sup>6</sup> at least partially his. It would be wearisome

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Nos. cv, cxxix, cxxx, cxxxi, cxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> These statistics were obtained by a minute examination of forty numbers of *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*.

<sup>3</sup> At its lowest Addison's average was 19 relatives, of which 5 were "that" (*The Tatler*, No. 117); Steele's highest was about the same, 19 relatives of which 4½ were "that" (*The Tatler*, No. 246).

<sup>4</sup> It may be worth pointing out that No. 24 of *The Tatler*, which Calder assigned to Addison perhaps by an oversight, exhibits Steele's characteristics (16 relatives with 1 "that" per thousand words), and that No. 237, which has been attributed to Addison on other grounds, shows *his* use of the relatives (25, of which 6 are "that").

<sup>5</sup> An eighteenth might be added. This is No. 134 and is almost certainly by Steele. The single correction, however, was clearly not dictated by motives of style, but by motives of propriety.

<sup>6</sup> No. 36 cannot have been corrected by Addison. He was in Dublin at the time, and the three days that elapsed between the publication of the essay and the appearance of the *errata* in 37 were not enough to have permitted him to communicate with Steele. The corrections are confined to the section of the paper headed "White's Chocolate-house." This section is probably not by Steele, but by one of his aristocratic friends, perhaps Anthony Henley or Wortley Montague.

some and it would take too long to reconduct that examination in public. I shall therefore confine myself here to a single essay, No. 151, which will be sufficient to illustrate the method adopted in each case and the kind of results that were obtained.<sup>1</sup>

No. 151 is a charming disquisition upon the caprices of feminine fashion. The corrections are printed in the *errata* at the end of 152,<sup>2</sup> and, though not very striking, are eminently Addisonian. Thus "drew away the Attention upon" is changed to "drew away the Attention to," and in the account of the lady who "transferr'd her Passion to that of a Tippet" the meaningless "that of" is omitted. The relatives approximate to Addison's average (24 per thousand, of which 9 are "that"). There is also to be noted the young beauty who had "taken an Air that showed a secret Satisfaction in her self"—in the context the epithet is quite otiose. But what is more striking than these details is the identity of the point of view and the subject-matter with some of Addison's acknowledged writings. I select two pronouncements upon that "fair Sex" which disturbed and fascinated him so continuously. The first is the injunction that women should have "no Opportunity given them to disfigure themselves, which they seldom fail to do whenever it lies in their Power." The second is the statement that they "are carried away with every Thing that is showy, and with what delights the Eye, more than any other Species of Living-Creatures whatsoever." It is a point of view that might be called misogyny, if it were more emphatic, less casual. The writer is not being paradoxical; he is mentioning, almost incidentally, a *fact*, which he assumes will be equally familiar to his readers. The divergence here from Steele's chivalrous attitude to women does not need to be stressed; it is the resemblance to Addison's point of view that I wish to point out.

Mr. Dobrée has called attention to "that marked aversion from the 'fair sex' which yet engaged so much of Addison's thought." "His intuition," he continues, "warned him against commerce with the fair sex, which, however, he never ceased to ridicule or try to improve. For although he knew their nature was antipathetic to his, it was not altogether foreign; some effeminacy in his own nature made them strangely fascinating to him; he could not leave

<sup>1</sup> Briefly my conclusions were as follows: 134 (Steele and Addison), 221 (Addison), 222 (Addison), 227 (Addison).

<sup>2</sup> This is an additional piece of evidence, as 152 is attributed to Addison in Tickell.

them alone in his essays." <sup>1</sup> Mr. Dobrée's contentions could be supported by a score of quotations from *The Tatler* or *The Spectator*. I shall content myself with two, which are of particular interest because they conclude with a kind of apology. It is as if this misogyny of Addison's was pathological, the product not of a conviction but of some psychological "fault," and that Addison himself, in his waking moments, was dismayedly conscious of the exaggerations he could not help falling into. No. 102 of *The Tatler* is the conclusion of that "Vision of Justice" which is rather a satire, almost mediævally scathing in its vehemence, upon the whole of the female sex. The essay concludes :

This Vision lasted till my usual Hour of Waking, which I did with some Surprise, to find my self alone, after having been engaged almost a whole Night in so prodigious a Multitude. I could not but reflect with Wonder, at the Partiality and Extravagance of my Vision ; which, according to my Thoughts, has not done Justice to the Sex. If Virtue in Men is more Venerable, it is in Women more Lovely.

No. 116 is lighter in tone. It is a satire, not upon Woman, but upon those extravagances of feminine fashion which culminated at this time in the hooped petticoat. The conclusion, however, is again a *volteface* :

I would not be understood that (while I discard this monstrous Invention) I am an Enemy to the proper Ornaments of the Fair Sex. . . . I consider Woman as a beautiful Romantick Animal, that may be adorned with Furs and Feathers, Pearls and Diamonds, Ores and Silks. The Lynx shall cast its Skin at her Feet to make her a Tippet ; the Peacock, Parrot, and Swan, shall pay Contributions to her Muff ; the Sea shall be searched for Shells, and the Rocks for Gems ; and every Part of Nature furnish out its Share towards the Embellishment of a Creature that is the most consummate Work of it.

*A beautiful romantic animal*, that was Addison's ideal, the not impossible she of his dreams. The "fair sex," for him, did not exist as thinking or sentient beings. It was their solitary duty to be "fair," to be items in the landscape. The passage is additionally interesting because it indicates the close connexion between this decorative conception of woman and Addison's perennial pre-occupation with the details of feminine costume. The "Farthingale," the "Furbelow," the "Hoop" or "Concave" petticoat, and the changing shapes and colours of their head-dresses, are perpetually

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 257-8.

being discussed or denounced in his essays with an unexpected passion. It is plain that these mysteries meant something more to Addison than they did to Steele or than they can do to us. They must have been the symbols to him of some ideal and unattainable beauty, and they startle him into something as near poetry as the prim conventions of his essay would allow.

With these considerations in mind it will be profitable to return to *The Tatler*, No. 151, and in particular to the following passage :

What Jewels can the charming *Cleora* place in her Ears, that can please her Beholders so much as her Eyes ? The Cluster of Diamonds upon the Breast can add no Beauty to the fair Chest of Ivory which supports it. It may indeed tempt a Man to steal a Woman, but never to love her. Let *Thalestris* change her self into a Motly Partly-coloured Animal: The Pearl Necklace, the Flowered Stomacher, the Artificial Nosegay, and Shaded Furbelow, may be of Use to attract the Eye of the Beholder, and turn it from the Imperfections of her Feature and Shape. But if Ladies will take my Word for it, (and as they dress to please Men, they ought to consult our Fancy rather than their own in this Particular) I can assure them, there is nothing touches our Imagination so much as a beautiful Woman in a plain Dress.

It is impossible not to be struck both by the animus against the other sex, except as objects of ornament, which the passage exhibits and by the reluctant fascination which it nevertheless shows for the *minutiæ* of feminine costume. I fancy it would be difficult to find another contemporary parallel to this curious combination of attraction and repulsion. To my mind, indeed, the whole essay is *aut Addisonus aut nemo*.

## SOME NOTES ON COWPER'S LETTERS AND POEMS

By KENNETH POVEY

THOUGH only one letter from Cowper to William Unwin written before 1778 is known to exist, from that year until Unwin's death in 1786 there is a series of more than a hundred and twenty, full of local and domestic news and opinions on all kinds of subjects, and generally including a copy of the latest poem. But unfortunately these very important letters do not appear in their right order in any edition of Cowper's correspondence, and a closer examination of them than has been undertaken by the editors of his poems solves several outstanding problems of identification and dating. My principal references are to the incomplete collection of original letters to Unwin in the British Museum (Additional MSS. 24,154-5) and to Mr. Thomas Wright's *Correspondence of William Cowper*, 1904. Mr. Wright's edition contains all the letters to Unwin which had previously been published, with a great deal of additional matter from the British Museum collection, and no new ones have since come to light.

The undated letter beginning "In a time of so much national distress" (Wright, i. 390) is a fragment published for the first time by Mr. Wright from the original in the British Museum; it is placed by him immediately after the letter of November 26, 1781. He heads it "To (probably) the Rev. William Unwin. Date probably 1781," and says in a note at the end, "Then follow lines To Sir Joshua Reynolds (written in 1781)." But since Cowper writes:

You are welcome to make what use you please of the following. It is a year old, but the public affairs give it even a greater propriety now than it had when it was first composed,

it seems as though either the poem or the letter were misdated. However, the manuscript is clearly not a letter to Unwin at all. It is written on smaller paper than usual, and does not fill it, the



fourth page being blank. It was evidently enclosed in a letter to Unwin with instructions to submit it to some editor, for there is a note on it, not in Unwin's hand :

March. 19. The following came to my hand above a Year ago—which is needful to be remembered.—I wish Mr. Cowper did not dwell so much on England's Glory—which for the present I doubt is a Non-Entity.

These lines to Sir Joshua Reynolds (" Dear President, whose art sublime ") are evidently what Cowper refers to in his letters to Newton (May 13 and December 4, 1781) and to Hill (December 2, 1781) as a prophetic poem written two or three years earlier, " not long after the double repulse sustained by Mr. D'Estaing at Lucia and at Savannah." Cowper's history is slightly confused, for Admiral D'Estaing was " doubly repulsed " at St. Lucia in September and December 1778 and defeated at Savannah in October 1779. The poem could not have been finished before the declaration of war by Holland in December 1780, but Cowper's vague statement in December 1781 that he had written it " two or three years earlier " seems to indicate that it was originally written about the end of 1779. In its present form it probably belongs to the end of 1780, the manuscript being a year later, as Mr. Wright has dated it.

The letter beginning " Dr. Beattie is a respectable character," which Mr. Wright (ii. 19) puts between November 4 and 18, 1782, was placed by Hayley, who first published it,<sup>1</sup> after that of November 18, and by Southey<sup>2</sup> after that of November 30, omitted by Hayley. It includes the poem *On the Loss of the Royal George* in English and Latin. The *Royal George* sank on August 29, 1782; it has been assumed that the poem was written shortly afterwards, and the letter has been dated accordingly. But in his letter of August 4, 1783, Cowper says he is glad Unwin was pleased with his Latin ode and English dirge, though the tune had obliged him to write in Alexandrines. The description cannot apply to any known poem except *The Royal George*, and the " Dr. Beattie " letter should therefore have been placed immediately before that of August 4, 1783. This position is confirmed by the expression in the letter, " the summer is going down apace." Since Cowper was in the habit of sending Unwin his occasional poems as soon as they were written, it would seem that the ascription of this one to the autumn of 1782

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Posthumous Writings of William Cowper*, iii. 161 (1804).

<sup>2</sup> *Life and Works of William Cowper* (1835), iv. 245.

is mistaken, and that it really belongs to the group of songs written for Lady Austen to sing at her harpsichord, among which it is printed by Hayley in his *Life of Cowper*, the *editio princeps* of the poem. There is no clue to the date except that the first song is headed "summer of 1783," and *The Royal George* is number 3.

The next two letters are unplaced in all the editions, and are printed with those of the year 1786, in which Unwin died. The first begins "You are my mahogany box, with a slip in the lid of it, to which I commit my productions of the lyric kind" (Wright, iii. 80). In it Cowper says :

He who cannot look forward with comfort, must find what comfort he can in looking backward. Upon this principle, I the other day sent my imagination upon a trip thirty years behind me. She was very obedient, and very swift of foot, presently performed her journey, and at last set me down in the sixth form at Westminster. I fancied myself once more a schoolboy, a period of life in which, if I had never tasted true happiness, I was at least equally unacquainted with its contrary. No manufacturer of waking dreams ever succeeded better in his employment than I do. I can weave such a piece of tapestry in a few minutes, as not only has all the charms of reality, but is embellished also with a variety of beauties which, though they never existed, are more captivating than any that ever did ; accordingly I was a schoolboy in high favour with my master, received a silver groat for my exercise, and had the pleasure of seeing it sent from form to form, for the admiration of all who were able to understand it. Do you wish to see this highly applauded performance ? It follows on the other side.

"Torn off," say all the editors. Grimshawe adds, "This jeu d'esprit has never been found, notwithstanding the most diligent inquiry ;" and Southey, "whatever it was, it had been torn off from the letter, and has perished. This is to be regretted ; for whether in prose or verse, it would have been a cheerful sketch of his boyhood."

The original letter is a half-sheet, without date or postmark, and the words "it follows on the other side" come at the foot of the second page. The next leaf, as the editors say, has been torn off, but Southey's assumption that it had perished was much too hasty. Since Cowper left Westminster in 1749, the letter must belong to 1779 or thereabouts. But there is another half-letter of that year, dated at the end May 1, and first printed by Mr. Wright (i. 153) from the British Museum collection. The continuity of the sense and the exact resemblance of paper, ink and handwriting show that

these two half-sheets make one letter. The supposed "cheerful sketch" was in reality an imaginary school exercise. Cowper goes on :

Not having the poem, and not having seen it these twenty years, I had much ado to recollect it, which has obliged me to tear off the first copy and write another.

Then follows his Latin translation of Prior's *Chloe and Euphelia*, which may be found in any complete edition of his poems.

The last letter begins "The fish happening to swim uppermost in my mind" (Wright, iii. 101). Hayley, who first published it, deliberately printed it last because it contains an important clue to some early writings of Cowper's which he was unable to identify, and no later editor, biographer or critic appears to have tried his hand at discovering them. In the course of the letter Cowper says :

I find the *Register* in all respects an entertaining medley ; but especially in this, that it has brought to my view some long forgotten pieces of my own production ;—I mean by the way two or three. These I have marked with my own initials, and you may be sure I found them peculiarly agreeable, as they had not only the grace of being mine, but that of novelty likewise to recommend them. It is at least twenty years since I saw them.

Hayley says in a footnote :

This dateless Letter, which is probably entitled to a very early place in this collection, was reserved to close the correspondence with Mr. Unwin, from the hope, that before the press advanced so far, the Editor might recover those unknown Verses of Cowper to which the Letter alludes, but all researches for this purpose have failed (*Life, etc., of Cowper*, vol. iii, p. 369).

He did not give up the quest after the publication of his biography, for there is in his own *Memoirs* a letter from him to John Johnson, dated May 9, 1805, in which he speaks of his attempts to trace some of Cowper's

early poems, which he told his young friend William Unwin he had observed in a book, that he called *The Register*. We supposed the *Annual Register* that Unwin lent him, and in which he marked the poems with his initials ; but the obliging mother of my young friend John Unwin [in plain language, Unwin's widow] looked carefully over the volumes of the *Register* now in her custody, and could not find the poems so marked. (*Memoirs of William Hayley*, ii. 152.)

Hayley, as a contemporary and friend of Cowper's, was in a much better position than any modern inquirer for discovering these

mysterious productions, but there is no need to give them up for lost because he could not find them. Though three editors have printed Cowper's letter from the original, none of them records that it is postmarked February 8; the contents indicate 1779 as the year. Once it is read in its natural surroundings, *The Register* becomes much easier to identify.

On December 3, 1778, Cowper writes to Unwin:

I was last night agreeably surprised by the arrival of Mr. Dodsley. His own merit is his sufficient recommendation; but his appearance, without having been expected or even thought of, made him still more welcome. You have done a kind thing in sending him, and I wish we could recompense it by a pine-apple for every volume.

Then on February 6 or 7 comes the reference to *The Register*, an entertaining medley, and the conclusion seems irresistible that "Mr. Dodsley" and "The Register" both stand for Dodsley's *Annual Register*. Again, on May 26, 1779, Cowper tells Unwin that he is obliged for Johnson's Poets, and adds:

I have looked into some of the volumes; but not having yet finished the Register, have merely looked into them.

So there were months of reading in *The Register*, and we know already that "Mr. Dodsley" was worth a comical number of home-grown pine-apples. And on February 27, 1780, he sends Unwin his fable *The Nightingale and the Glow-worm*, in explanation of which he says:

In a philosophical tract in the Register, I found it asserted that the glowworm is the nightingale's proper food.

The *Annual Registers* for 1768 and 1774 do actually contain articles dealing with the habits of the nightingale, extracted from the *Philosophical Transactions*, and though glow-worms are not mentioned in them, Cowper may well have mistaken the source of his information after he had returned the books to Unwin; or he may be simply poking fun at the habit of giving learned references in support of poetical imaginings.

There are, however, very few anonymous poems in all the volumes from the commencement of the *Register* in 1758 to 1763 which could plausibly be attributed to Cowper, even supposing that his initials had been erased from the marked copies. The later volumes are hardly worth considering, because as a rule only poems of the year

were reprinted, and Cowper is not known to have published anything but a few hymns between 1763 and 1779. The explanation of the mystery may nevertheless be quite simple. Hayley, instead of running away with the idea that Cowper was referring to poems, ought to have remembered that he wrote a good many periodical essays in his early years.<sup>1</sup> So that, in the absence of any marked poems, his lost works should have been looked for in the prose parts of the *Annual Register*. And since he says loosely that he had not seen them for twenty years, the earlier the volume, the more likely it is to contain them. Taking the first half-dozen volumes of the *Register* and eliminating the signed and otherwise identifiable essays and those which are quite impossible on grounds of style or subject, there remain about six candidates for admission to the Cowper canon. The one with the best claim seems to be the dissertation on spoilt children in the 1758 volume, which very closely resembles in matter, treatment and style Cowper's 115th *Connoisseur*. But it must be confessed that even if the identifications could be made, Cowper's literary reputation would not be greatly increased, however much the history of his early life might be cleared up by further light on his writings, whether in prose or verse.

<sup>1</sup> In spite of the reference in the context to "dabbling in rhyme," which may allude to something in Unwin's own letter.

## ANGLO-SAXON: A SEMANTIC STUDY

BY KEMP MALONE

THE only comprehensive discussion of the term *Anglo-Saxon* is that given by Sir James Murray in the article "Anglo-Saxon" of the *New English Dictionary*.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately Murray's article is markedly incomplete and to some extent inaccurate. A new study of the term therefore seems desirable. I have undertaken such a study in the hope that my results may serve to correct and supplement the studies already in print.

Murray recognises the following three meanings for the term *Anglo-Saxon* as used in English (I quote his definitions verbatim):

I. English Saxon, Saxon of England: *orig.* a collective name for the Saxons of Britain as distinct from the "Old Saxons" of the continent. Hence, properly applied to the Saxons (of Wessex, Essex, Middlesex, Sussex, and perhaps Kent), as distinct from the Angles.

II. Extended to the entire Old English people and language before the Norman Conquest.

III. Used rhetorically for *English* in its wider or ethnological sense, in order to avoid the later historical restriction of "English" as distinct from Scotch, or the modern political restriction of "English" as opposed to American of the United States; thus applied to (1) all persons of Teutonic descent (or who reckon themselves such) in Britain, whether of English, Scotch, or Irish birth; (2) all of this descent in the world, whether subjects of Great Britain or of the United States.

In my discussion I will refer to these definitions as "Murray I, II, III."

Murray arranged his definitions in what he thought to be the correct chronological order. In other words, his "I" was to him the oldest meaning of the word. I will begin my study with an inquiry into this point. How did our term originate, and what was the first meaning assigned to it? The tale must start with the

<sup>1</sup> J. Hoops's valuable article in the *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde* is devoted chiefly to the use of the term in early mediæval times. For other studies, see the bibliography which Prof. Hoops appends to his article.



Saxons. These were a Germanic tribe of the North Sea coast, first mentioned by the geographer Ptolemy (*circa* 150 A.D.). Ptolemy puts them "on the neck of the Cimbric peninsula" and on three North Sea islands "near the mouth of the Elbe." In his day, therefore, they probably dwelt in western Holstein or in western Slesvig.<sup>1</sup> During the third century, however, they seem to have migrated westward along the coast (travelling by sea, no doubt), for throughout the fourth century we find them in possession of the German coast from Elbe to Ems, whereas the testimony of *Widsith*, 42 ff., indicates that in the fourth century they did not hold the west coast of Slesvig or Holstein. During the fourth and fifth centuries the Saxons won such fame as marauders by sea that the Saxon name became a generic term for a North Sea pirate, whatever his tribe might be, much as in later times the Danish name stood for any Scandinavian pirate. Hence the Saxons, Angles and Jutes who conquered eastern Britain in the fifth century were all called Saxons by their victims and by the Continental writers of the day, and the name was long kept as a generic term for the English settlers and their descendants, irrespective of the tribal divisions and subdivisions which held for many centuries. In general, one may say that the Continental (and British) writers were not interested in the tribal (or political) subdivisions of the English, but lumped the whole under the generic term *Saxon*. Among the English themselves the terminology was altogether different. As Freeman puts it,

The word "Saxon" is never used, in the native tongue, to express either the whole nation or any part of it which was not strictly Saxon.<sup>2</sup>

The name which the English applied to themselves first occurs, in Latinised form, in the writings of Pope Gregory the Great, at the close of the sixth century. With Gregory the generic term for the English was *Angli*, and we have every reason to think that in this usage, so contrary to that of his Continental contemporaries, he was conforming to the practice of the English themselves.<sup>3</sup> The term *Angli* gradually won ground on the Continent (by virtue of its support in native usage), and, after several centuries of wavering, the Conti-

<sup>1</sup> See H. M. Chadwick, *The Origin of the English Nation*, pp. 203 ff.

<sup>2</sup> E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, vol. i, Appendix, note A.

<sup>3</sup> The *Angli* of Tacitus is of course a specific or tribal name, not a generic name, and the same must be said of the *Angiloi* of Procopius. Gregory was thus the first writer to use the term in its extended or generic sense, inclusive of Saxons and Jutes as well as Angles.

nental writers finally gave up their older generic term *Saxones* in favour of *Angli*.

The shift of terms was perhaps facilitated by the fact that the term *Saxones* had another meaning: it might refer to the Saxons of Germany, a tribe that became particularly notorious in the eighth century by virtue of its stubborn resistance to Christianity and to Charles. In most cases, it is true, the term was not ambiguous; the context showed clearly enough which Saxons were meant. Now and then, however, *Saxon* wanted qualification, if ambiguity was to be avoided. English writers like Bede and Alfred solved the problem by calling the Saxons of Germany the "Old Saxons." On the Continent the same terminology was occasionally used, but qualification was oftener resorted to if the reference was to the English. Paul the Deacon, in his history of the Longobards, mentions the English several times, but instead of calling them plain *Saxones* he says now *Angli Saxones*, now *Saxones Angli*. Paulus might have avoided ambiguity much more simply, it is true. He might have called the English *Angli* and let it go at that. But he could not bring himself to give up the good old familiar term *Saxones*, even though he had to qualify it to keep it from being ambiguous. In this way the English became endowed with a third generic name, a kind of informal compounding of the other two. This third name was never much used. The ordinary names continued to be *Saxones* and *Angli* until the end of the tenth century, when *Angli* won the victory over its rivals. But *Angli Saxones* as a name for the English had a certain currency in learned Continental writings from the days of Paulus down to the end of the tenth century. That the term meant "the English," and not "the Saxons of England as distinct from the Angles," is clear at once from the pages of Paulus, its inventor, who once uses it (iv, 37) with reference to a Kentish princess. Since *Angli Saxones* appears in Paulus later on (vi, 15) in connection with the West Saxon King Ceadwalla, it has been inferred that Paulus used the term in the sense "Saxons of England." But in this passage the meaning "English" (without tribal reference) obviously fits equally well, and since "English" is the only meaning possible in the earlier passage, the meaning "English" rather than "Saxons of England" must be accepted for Paulus in general. Later usage, both on the Continent and in England, confirms this conclusion. Thus, in Continental writings the English scholar Alcuin (who was an Angle) is called once an

*Engelsaxo*, once a man of the *Saxones*. This does not mean that the writers were mistaken about Alcuin's tribe. It means that they were using these terms in their usual generic sense, without reference to the tribal divisions of the English.

Toward the end of the ninth century our compound term was introduced into England by Asser the Welshman, who uses it repeatedly, in the form *Angulsaxones*, in his life of King Alfred. The term occurs only in the title which Asser gives to Alfred: *Rex Angulsaxonum*. We have no evidence that Alfred himself used this title, but there can be no doubt that Asser so betitled him. And the biographer's meaning is clear enough. He gives to Alfred's foregoers the title *Rex Occidentalium Saxonum*, but to Alfred the title *Rex Angulsaxonum*. The former were merely kings of the West Saxons. The latter was king of the English. In other words, Asser uses the term *Angulsaxones* much as it was used in his Continental sources. And yet a shade of difference may be found. The contrast which Asser makes between Alfred and his foregoers indicates that for him *Angulsaxones* meant "all the English" rather than a mere "the English." Very possibly, as Stevenson has surmised,<sup>1</sup> the compound *Angulsaxones* symbolised for Asser the political union of the Angles and Saxons which Alfred accomplished.

Whether Alfred used the title *Rex Angulsaxonum* or not, his successors, down to the time of Eadgar, made occasional use of it in legal documents. After the accession of Eadgar (959 A.D.) the title was dropped, and has never been revived. Its use in England, then, was confined (1) to the first half of the tenth century, roughly speaking; (2) to legal documents written wholly or partly in Latin, or translated from Latin; and (3) to the immediate successors of Alfred. Moreover, the title seems to have been rare, even during the period when it was in use; ordinarily the West Saxon king was referred to, even in legal documents, as *Rex Saxonum* (the earlier use) or as *Rex Anglorum* (the later use). Again, the term *Angulsaxones* seems never to have been used in England except in connection with the Royal title. Hence it always occurs in the genitive plural.

So far we have dealt exclusively with Latin writings. But from Latin our term made its way into English, and Murray's article is devoted to its history as an English, not as a Latin, word. Murray rests his definition "I" wholly (so far as the substantive is concerned) upon examples found in two tenth-century charters. The first of

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Stevenson, *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, p. 149.

these is a charter, probably spurious, attributed to King Æthelstan. The charter exists in two versions : a Latin version and an English translation of the Latin. King Æthelstan is betitled at the beginning and at the end of the charter. The English version of the charter gives the king the title *Ongol Saxna cyning* in both places (beginning and end). This translates an *Angul Saxonum rex* of the Latin version at the end of the charter, but a mere *rex* at the beginning. I take it the translator inserted his *Ongol Saxna* at the beginning for the sake of uniformity with the corresponding title at the end of the charter. The title in all likelihood means "king of the English," and does not support "Murray I."<sup>1</sup> The second charter is a grant by King Eadred, which begins as follows :

En onomatos cyriou doxa. Al wisdom ge for Gode ge for werolde is gestaðelad on þæm hefonlican gold horde almæhtiges Godes per Jhesum Christum cooperante gratia spiritus sancti. He hafað geweorðad mid Cynedome Angul seaxna Eadred cyning ond casere totius Britanniae Deo gratias.<sup>2</sup>

In this curious mixture of English, Latin, and Greek our term occurs, in the genitive plural (as usual), but in spite of Murray it probably means "English" rather than "Saxons of England." Murray gives no further examples of our term as an Old English word, but Stevenson, *loc. cit.*, has pointed out one more passage in which the term occurs. We find it in the following verses written in praise of Ealdhelm and recorded in a tenth-century MS. :

þus me gesette sanctus et iustus,  
beorn boca gleaw, bonus auctor,  
Ealdhelm, æpele sceop, etiam fuit  
ipselos on æðel angolseaxna,  
byscop on Bretene. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Here the last two lines are variations, the one of the other, in the familiar Old English style. Hence the "land of the Anglo-Saxons" of line 4 means precisely the same thing as the "Britain" of line 5. In other words, our term here must mean "English," and the meaning "Saxons of England" is out of the question. It is worth noting that these verses, like the charter of Eadred, are written in a mixture of English, Latin and Greek. Further, in the verses we have to do

<sup>1</sup> Both versions of this charter are printed by W. de G. Birch in his *Cartularium Saxonicum*, vol. ii, pp. 408 ff., the Latin as No. 705, the English as No. 706.

<sup>2</sup> Birch, vol. iii, pp. 70 f. (No. 909).

<sup>3</sup> *Old English Glosses*, ed. A. S. Napier, p. xiv, in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Med. and Mod. Series, Part XI. Oxford, 1900.

with titles, applied not to a king but to a prince (for Ealdhelm was of the West Saxon royal family). As an OE. word, then, our term occurs in three documents only: two Royal charters and a poem in praise of a prince. Two of these documents are written in a mixture of English, Latin and Greek; the third is a translation from the Latin. In every case our word occurs in the genitive plural. In every case it is a part of an epithetic or titular phrase applied to a Royal personage. In every case it is to be dated in the tenth century. In one case it must mean "English," and in the other cases the same meaning seems probable because of the context. We may conclude that the earliest meaning for *Anglo-Saxon* in our language, and the only mediæval sense of the term, was "English," and that this meaning deserves the first place in a dictionary article.<sup>1</sup>

The mediæval substantive, then, which Murray records under his meaning "I" does not seem to exist. I will now proceed to the adjective which he gives under the same meaning. Of this adjective he writes as follows:

In this Dictionary, the language of England before 1100 is called, as a whole, "Old English" (OE.); *Anglo-Saxon*, when used, is restricted to the Saxon as distinguished from the Anglian *dialects* of Old English; thus we may say that *eald* was the Anglo-Saxon (*i.e.* West Saxon and Kentish) form of the normal OE. *ald* (retained in Anglian), whence, and not from *eald*, we have mod. Eng. *old*.

Murray gives no examples of this use, and I have found none (though diligent search might well reveal a few). It is undoubtedly convenient to have a term which includes both the West Saxon and the Kentish dialects of Old English, but *Anglo-Saxon* was never much used in this sense and is nowadays hardly so used at all. In a dictionary article of to-day, then, this meaning, if recorded at all, ought to be marked *obsolete*.

Another meaning, akin to that just mentioned, is exemplified in the following quotation:

. . . The Wessex dialect of Alfred himself . . . is the dialect that is now technically called "*Anglo-Saxon*," though it is by no means a good

<sup>1</sup> In certain charters the terms *Angli* and *Angulsaxonnes* both seem not to include the Northumbrians. In one case, indeed, *Angli* apparently does not include the Mercians! This peculiarity is however not due to any intent to exclude either Northumbrians or Mercians from the scope of the term. It is nothing more than a stylistic peculiarity, a characteristic of the so-called *Kanzleistyl*, with its heaping up of titles without discrimination, or, as Stevenson terms it (*op. cit.*, p. 150), rhetorical embroidery. This use therefore need not concern us here.



name for it, seeing that it is almost wholly Saxon, and hardly Anglian at all; and this is why many scholars prefer to call it West Saxon.<sup>1</sup>

Murray does not record this meaning of *Anglo-Saxon*, although it undoubtedly had a certain currency. Nowadays this meaning too is probably obsolete, the unambiguous *West Saxon* having taken its place.

In the present century *Anglo-Saxon* acquired yet another meaning (naturally not recorded by Murray) which is best taken up at this point. I refer to the meaning assigned to the term by Prof. H. M. Chadwick, as a result of his researches into the origin of the English. Mr. Chadwick says :

The conclusion to which we have been brought is that the [Germanic] invaders of Britain belonged not to three but to two distinct nationalities, which we may call Jutish and Anglo-Saxon. The former occupied Kent and southern Hampshire, the latter the rest of the conquered territory. . . . The Anglo-Saxons may not originally have been a homogeneous people, . . . but there is no evidence that any national difference survived at the time when they invaded Britain.<sup>2</sup>

Since this theory of Mr. Chadwick's has not won general acceptance, this meaning of our term has not come into general use, but nothing which Mr. Chadwick does can be ignored, and *Anglo-Saxon* in the sense which he gives it certainly deserves a place in the dictionary.

We now come to Murray's second meaning: "The entire Old English people and language before the Norman Conquest." There are various objections which might be raised to this formulation. First, the word "Old" seems superfluous. Again, the time-limit set, viz. 1066 A.D., is certainly too rigid; in fact, many scholars would prefer another date, as 1100, 1150, or even 1200 A.D. This range and flexibility in the actual use of the term ought to be reflected in the definition given in the dictionary. But the most serious objection to Murray's "II" arises out of the fact that the definition ignores the usage of a large and important group of writers and speakers, both learned and lay, who use *Anglo-Saxon* not in the sense "Old English" but in the sense "pre-English." One may look at Saxon England from two points of view: that of the *inclusionist* and that of the *exclusionist*. The former thinks of Saxon times as an integral part of English history; the latter, as a separate and distinct epoch, which leads up to English history indeed but forms no proper

<sup>1</sup> W. W. Skeat, *The King's English*, in A. Bowker, *The King Alfred Millenary*, p. 169.

<sup>2</sup> *The Origin of the English Nation*, pp. 88 f.



part of it. To the inclusionist, English history begins with the invasion of Britain by the Saxons, Angles and Jutes in the fifth century. To the exclusionist, English history begins with the Norman Conquest in the eleventh century, or even with Runnymede (the stretch from 1066 to 1215 being then classified as the period of incubation, or of embryonic activity). Thus, Macaulay tells us :

Here [with the thirteenth century] commences the history of the English nation. . . . Sterile and obscure as is that portion of our annals, it is there that we must seek for the origin of our freedom, our prosperity, and our glory. Then it was that the great English people was formed. . . . Then was formed that language . . . inferior to the tongue of Greece alone. Then too appeared the first faint dawn of that noble literature, the most splendid and the most durable of the many glories of England. Early in the fourteenth century the amalgamation of the races was all but complete ; and it was soon made manifest, by signs not to be mistaken, that a people inferior to none existing in the world had been formed by the mixture of three branches [Saxon, Dane and Norman] of the great Teutonic family with each other, and with the aboriginal Britons. There was, indeed, scarcely any thing in common between the England to which John had been chased by Philip Augustus, and the England from which the armies of Edward the Third went forth to conquer France.<sup>1</sup>

That the term *Anglo-Saxon* is widely used to give expression to this point of view will be sufficiently obvious from the quotations which follow.

I will begin with Francis A. March, a scholar whose memory will always be cherished as one of the pioneers in English linguistics. In an early paper of his I find the following statement :

Mr. A. J. Ellis in his great work on Early English pronunciation gives the sounds of all the letters in Anglo-Saxon and English.<sup>2</sup>

Here *Anglo-Saxon* obviously means, not a mere period of *English*, but something apart from *English* and independent of it. In the next volume of the *Transactions* (pp. 97 ff.) March defended at length this use of *Anglo-Saxon* and the exclusionist point of view, and he remained an exclusionist all his days. A more recent expression of opinion is to be found in the *History of English Literature* of E. Legouis and L. Cazamian :

Anglo-Saxon literature cannot be an integral part of English literature. It has rightly no other relation to English literature than the life of his father or mother has to the life of the hero of a biography.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> T. B. Macaulay, *History of England*, cap. i (ed. C. H. Firth, vol. i, pp. 12 f.).

<sup>2</sup> *Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1871*, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. 1, *The Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, by E. Legouis (New York, 1926), p. 3.

The exclusionist point of view could not be better put than Mr. Legouis puts it here, and throughout his volume Mr. Legouis consistently uses *Anglo-Saxon* in the sense "pre-English." Another distinguished philologist, Prof. George Saintsbury, is equally clear. He tells us :

The distinction between Anglo-Saxon and English is one of those things which escape the too curious inquirer, but present no difficulties to the *communis sensus*.<sup>1</sup>

Evidently Prof. Saintsbury is an exclusionist, and he practises what he preaches too : his *History of English Prosody* begins with Middle English. Yet another eminent philologist, the late Jessie Weston, writes as follows :

It [Lazamon's *Bruf*] marks the transition point from Anglo-Saxon to English, and is therefore one of the very earliest monuments of English literature, in the strict sense of the term.<sup>2</sup>

The following quotation from the Newbolt Report to the British Board of Education is also in point here :

The sources of Chaucer and of his successors are in the main not English at all, still less Anglo-Saxon.<sup>3</sup>

In this quotation *Anglo-Saxon* obviously means "pre-English." The Report is not consistent in its terminology, however ; occasionally *Anglo-Saxon* is used in the sense "Old English" (as on p. 216).

Mr. George Williams, in a recent number of the (New York) *Nation*, warns a man, ambitious to become a college English teacher, of the terrors that are in store for him as a graduate student. Among other trials he mentions this :

You must be saving your money for . . . the year when you will show . . . that you have mastered Anglo-Saxon, Old German, Old French, Icelandic, and the whole range of English and American literature.<sup>4</sup>

*Anglo-Saxon* here means either "pre-English" or something even more remote from English. Another interesting example appears in the following quotation from Mr. L. D. Peterkin, who writes in the *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* of January 27, 1927, with reference to the New Plan of Honours in English at Harvard College :

<sup>1</sup> *History of English Prosody*, vol. i, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Chief Middle English Poets*, p. 375.

<sup>3</sup> *The Teaching of English in England* (London, 1921), pp. 212 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Nation*, December 5, 1928, p. 602.

... In the General Honours Anglo-Saxon is not required. ... Encouragement is afforded to those men whose interest is ... in English Literature rather than in Anglo-Saxon and Linguistics.<sup>1</sup>

Evidently the admirable literary course in *Beowulf* which Mr. Kirtledge gives for Harvard undergraduates every year is not looked upon, by Mr. Peterkin at least, as a course in the field of English literature, and one must conclude that for Mr. Peterkin *Anglo-Saxon* means "pre-English." Again, the following passage, from the pen of the philologist and poet, Richard Aldington, is in point :

French poetry is some centuries older than English ; it had already produced a large body of works in various genres when Chaucer wrote his *Canterbury Tales*.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Aldington of course knows that *Beowulf* is a poem, but he evidently does not think of it as an English poem. In other words, he is an exclusionist, and *Anglo-Saxon* to him means "pre-English." Finally, I will cite what Miss Harriet Monroe, the editor and poet, has to say on this subject. She remarks :

Our present-day American poets . . . [are] shaking hands with the poets of Chaucer's time and are broadcasting the idea of poetry gained when the English language was being formed from the Anglo-Saxon and French.<sup>3</sup>

Miss Monroe's *Anglo-Saxon* clearly means "pre-English."

A multitude of further examples might be brought forward, but those which I have quoted will suffice to show that *Anglo-Saxon* often means "pre-English" rather than "Old English." In many cases, it is true, the exact meaning is hard to determine. If the reader does not already know an author's point of view, he may have to read a whole article through (as I did the other day) in order to find out what an *Anglo-Saxon* in the first sentence means. But the lexicographer, unlike the editor, is not expected to quote ambiguous passages to illustrate his definitions, and certainly in the present case, since so many examples are at hand in which the meaning "pre-English" is assured, this meaning ought to be recognised in our better dictionaries.

I pass now to "Murray III." We have already seen that the mediæval examples belong here rather than under "I." The

<sup>1</sup> I quote at second hand, from the *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, vol. xiii, p. 270.

<sup>2</sup> *French Studies and Reviews*, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> *Baltimore Evening Sun*, May 21, 1926 (news dispatch).

modern examples which Murray gives sufficiently illustrate the political and ethnological aspects of the matter, but no examples are given of the widespread application of *Anglo-Saxon* to the language and the literature of to-day. All other English dictionaries, great and small, are similarly deficient. The following examples may serve to correct this serious deficiency, and to show the age and distribution of the term in a meaning neglected by the lexicographers.

1841 (1863). Sir Charles Lyell, *Antiquity of Man* (Amer. ed. p. 466): "... When I travelled in 1841 among the [Germans of Pennsylvania] ... I found the newspapers full of terms half English and half German, and many an Anglo-Saxon word which had assumed a Teutonic dress, as "fencen" to fence, ... "flauer" for flour, ... and so on."

1859. Seba Smith, *My Thirty Years out of the Senate*, by Major Jack Downing, Preface (p. 10): "... the universally admitted fact, that the writings of the genuine original Major Downing present the best and truest exposition of the peculiar Yankee dialect of the Anglo-Saxon language that there is extant."

1874. Henry Sweet, *History of English Sounds* (p. 158): "If any period of our language is to be called 'Anglo-Saxon,' let it be the present one."

1889. Eugene Field, *A Little Book of Western Verse* (p. 115): "I like the Anglo-Saxon speech With its direct revealings."

1909. J. Walter McSpadden, *Stories of Robin Hood and his Merry Outlaws*, Introduction (p. ix): "Songs and legends of Robin Hood ... are among the earliest heirlooms of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, dating back to the time when Chaucer wrote his *Canterbury Tales*."

1925. Fergus Hume, *The Blue Talisman* (p. 99): "His ignorance of English was certainly a bar to social intercourse, but Ng'wam was singularly intelligent, and began to understand what was said, although he could not utter many Anglo-Saxon words himself."

1926. Richard A. Mabie, in *American Speech* (i. 265): "the jargon daily spoken by witnesses believing they talk pure Anglo-Saxon."

1927. Leon Howard, in *American Speech* (ii. 498): "some of these words of apparently American origin have become established in the Anglo-Saxon language in spite of the disapproval so frankly expressed by the eminent English journal."

1927. Odell Shepard, in *Yale Review*, Jan. (p. 414): "Tell me what you forget and I will tell you what you are, says the psycho-analyst. But I can do this too, and in plain Anglo-Saxon. The man who insists on telling me what he forgets is a fool."

1927. Press dispatch from London (Nov. 23): "Several Labourites were suspended in the House of Commons to-night to the accompaniment of a wild uproar and the hurling of bald Anglo-Saxon epithets." The epithets in question were: "Damned unfair, contemptible and unmanly, damned outrage, unfair partisanship, you're a coward."

1928. Interview in London *Daily Mail* (reprinted in *Literary Digest*, Jan. 7, pp. 25 f.): "A whole series of . . . circumstances worked together to introduce [into Germany] the giant stream of living Anglo-Saxon literature. Kipling . . . Stevenson . . . Galsworthy . . . D. H. Lawrence . . . Upton Sinclair . . . Sinclair Lewis."

1928. *Times Lit. Supp.*, Aug. 9 (p. 581). "Professor G. combats M. C.'s opinion that Kipling's content was new and that he conquered new territories for Anglo-Saxon poetry."

Other examples could readily be added to this list, of course.

A meaning of *Anglo-Saxon* not easily classified under any of Murray's rubrics is that exemplified in the following quotation:

Why should the expressions for certain ideas be called slang when we use Anglo-Saxon words, but not slang when we use for the same ideas the equivalent Latin words? Thus to call an objecting man a *kicker* is slang; to use the Latin equivalent *recalcitrant* is entirely acceptable. I use slang when I say that I *go for* a man or that I *jump on* him; but the Latin *assail*, or *assault*, or *insult* is free from any taint. I may ask one whether he *comprehends*, but to use the Anglo-Saxon equivalent, *catch on*, is slang.<sup>1</sup>

Here *Anglo-Saxon* means "plain, everyday English," while *Latin* means "formal, bookish English." In this terminology the etymology of the words plays no part in their classification as Anglo-Saxon or Latin, and the classification is based wholly on distinctions in the usage of to-day. Prof. Fries did not invent this meaning of *Anglo-Saxon*, needless to say; he merely gave it dignity and standing by adopting it as a technical term in a learned work.

I will conclude this paper with an analytical summary of the semantics of *Anglo-Saxon*, a summary which will, I hope, prove useful to lexicographers and to Anglicists at least. I follow Murray in recognising three divisions of the subject, but my divisions differ considerably from his. The summary follows: *Anglo-Saxon* may mean

I. English in the broad or unrestricted sense, *i.e.* without regard to historical periods, political boundaries, or geographical areas; applied to the English people and their culture (laws, customs, language, literature, etc.) from the fifth century to the present day, in England, Scotland, Ireland, America, etc. This is the oldest sense of the word and the only meaning recorded in the Middle Ages; it is also the most frequent meaning in popular speech to-day.

II. English in some restricted sense; various restrictions are applied:

A. Temporal restriction to the Saxon period of English history (circa 400 to 1066 A.D.) to which a part or the whole of the Norman

<sup>1</sup> C. C. Fries, *The Teaching of the English Language* (New York, 1927), p. 97.

period (1066-1154) is often added. In recent use this meaning has declined in relative frequency, since many writers prefer *Old English* or go back to the older term *Saxon*.

B. The same temporal restriction as in A, together with a geographical or political restriction to Wessex. This meaning was not infrequent in the nineteenth century, but has now been superseded by *West Saxon*.

C. The same temporal restriction as in A, together with a geographical or political restriction to the Saxon and Jutish shires (as against the Anglian shires). This meaning was always rare, and is now apparently obsolete.

D. Temporal restriction to the fifth, sixth, and (with reservations) seventh centuries, together with a cultural restriction to the Anglian and Saxon shires (as against the Jutish shires). This meaning arose in the present century, and has a certain currency among a limited group of writers.

E. Temporal restriction to modern times, or to late mediæval and modern times. This meaning (exemplified in the quotation above from Mr. McSpadden) arose out of the temporal restriction of *English* (as in the quotation above from Macaulay); if *Anglo-Saxon* and *English* are felt to have the same scope, then any restriction placed on *English* may bring about a like restriction on *Anglo-Saxon*.

F. Temporal restriction to recent times and the present day, together with a further restriction to colloquial, informal, plain English speech (as against archaic, formal or bookish speech). This meaning is rather frequent nowadays, particularly as applied to oaths, slang and frank speech.

III. Pre-English (involving a restriction of *English* to the later Middle Ages and modern times). This meaning rivals in frequency, at the present time, the meaning "I" of my classification. It occurs so much oftener than the meaning "II, A" ("Old English") that, in doubtful cases, one is usually justified in presuming that "pre-English" rather than "Old English" is the meaning intended.



## THE ENEMIES OF MAN

BY CONSTANCE BULLOCK

THE following vigorous little poem is contained in the Auchinleck Miscellany,<sup>1</sup> and has been printed only thrice within the last ninety years: in 1837 in *Owain Miles, and other inedited Fragments*, ed. Turnbull; in 1886, in *Englische Studien*, vol. 9, ed. Kölbing, and, lastly, in 1924 in Professor Carleton Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*.

Both Turnbull's and Kölbing's transcriptions are faulty here and there, and the notes which have been made from time to time upon the obscure passages, seem to need some little discussion;<sup>2</sup> but apart from the opportunities it offers for mere academic emendations and annotations, the poem has a certain amount of literary interest. Its form is not one which conduces to grace and ease of utterance. There is in it a difficulty within a difficulty—rigid alliteration within rigid rhyme. Nevertheless it must be confessed that the poet, if one can call him such, has succeeded very well within these serious limits. What he has lacked in grace he has gained in strength.

The theme was very much favoured by mediæval writers, particularly the clerics. Whatever may have been the individual opinions of the clergy concerning the relative values of pessimism and optimism as stimulants to the lay conscience, their artistic inspiration seems invariably to have been warmed at the fires of Hell. But, after all, they were merely human in this. Not even Milton has proved that a thoroughly satisfactory poetic inspiration is to be found in Heaven. The writer of this little poem, therefore, is at one with the spirit of his time, as far as subject-matter goes. The World, the Flesh, the Devil, and ever-victorious Death are bold and crafty enemies. So say St. Bernard, St. Bede, and hosts of other teachers,

<sup>1</sup> In the National Library of Scotland. The poem is published with the kind permission of the Trustees of the Library.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Carleton Brown's text is, as we should expect, good, but his notes are few and pass over much without comment.

and, like a dutiful son of the Church, our poet imitates both their precepts and their pessimism. What originality he has appears in his expression. There is a homely sincerity in it; and the images he uses are vigorous and to the point. Sometimes they give a "fillip" to the moral—

Noiþer he stintes nor stokes  
Bot ay prickes and prokes,

and sometimes a stinging little lash to the greedy :

þe war leuer swelt vnder sword  
þan parti of þi peni hord.

Above all, the alliteration which he has so ably handled, contributes the real force to the piece. Poetry and moralising never go well together. The lack-lustre qualities of the latter bewilder a poet, but this Northerner manages to knock life into its limp body at nearly every line. Whoever reads his poem can at least give him praise for having produced such a creditable result from a boring, hackneyed, and doleful subject.

## I.

þe siker soþe who so seys  
Wiþ diol dreye we our days,  
And walk mani wil ways  
As wandrand wiþtes.  
5 Al our games ous agas,  
So mani tenes on tas  
þurch fonding of fele fas  
þat fast wiþ ous fiþtes.  
Our flesche is fouled wiþ þe fende ;  
10 þer we finde a fals frende.  
þei þai heuen vp her hende  
þai no hold nouzt her hiþtes.  
þis er þre þat er þra,  
þete þe ferþ is our fa,  
15 Deþ, þat derieþ ous awa  
And diolely ous diþtes.

2 diol] dwl T.  
6 on] ou [s] B.  
16 diolely] dwlely T.

## II.

- Þis world wileþ þus, y wat,  
 Þurch falsschip of fair hat.  
 Where we go bi ani gat  
 20 Wiþ bale he ous bites.  
 Now kirt, now care,  
 Now min, now mare,  
 Now sounde, now sare,  
 Now song, now sites,  
 25 Now nouzt, now ynouzt,  
 Now wele, now wouzt,  
 Now is in longing þat louzt,  
 Þat o pis liif lites.  
 Now gentē, now gan,  
 30 Y tel it bot a lent lan,  
 When al þe welþ of our wan  
 Þus oway wites.

## III.

- Now vnder, now ouer,  
 Now cast, now couer,  
 35 Now plente, now pouer  
 Now pine, now plawe,  
 Now he þen, now here,  
 Now feble, now fere,  
 Now swift, now swere,  
 40 Now snelle, now slawe,  
 Now nouzt, now ynouzt,  
 Now fals, now frouzt;  
 Þe world timeþ ous touzt  
 Fram wawe to wawe,  
 45 Til we be broyden in a brayd,  
 Þat our lickham is layd  
 In a graue þat is grayd  
 Vnder lame lawe

## IV.

- When derne deþ ous haþ ydiht,  
 50 Is non so war no so wiht  
 Þat he no felles him in fiht,

18 falsschip] falschip T.

20 he] *omitted by T.*

29 gente] geten K. B. (see Notes).

43 tirneþ] tirueþ K. T. B.

49 ydiht] diht T.

- As fire dos in tunder.  
 Yer nis no letting at lite  
 Yat he no tittes til him tite.  
 55 Yat he hap sammned in site  
 Sone wel he sunder.  
 Noiþer he stintes no stokes,  
 Bot ay prickes and prokes,  
 Til he vnclustri al þe lokes  
 60 Yat liif ligges vnder.  
 When y tent til him take,  
 Hou schuld ich ani mirþe make,  
 Or wele in þis warld wake ?  
 Ywis it were wonder !

## V.

- 65 Deþ, þat deries ous zete,  
 And makes mani wonges wete,  
 Yer nis no liif þat he wil lete  
 To lache when him list.  
 When he is lopen out of les  
 70 No pray noman after pes  
 For non giftes þat ges.  
 Mai noman til him trist.  
 Our gode frendes has he fot,  
 And put þe pouer to þe pot,  
 75 And ouer him yknett his knott  
 Vnder his clay kist.  
 Derne deþ opon þe zong,  
 Wiþ þe to striue it is strong !  
 Y wold be wreken of mi wrong  
 80 3if y way wist !

## VI.

When þou has gaderd and yglened,  
 Long ly opon and lened,  
 Sparely þi gode spened,  
 And loþ for to lete ;

- 52 dos] doþ K.  
 54 tittes] tilles K. (see Notes). til] al T.  
 55 sammned] samned T.  
 56 sone] Loue B.  
 57 he] be T.  
 73 has] hap K.  
 79 mi] vn T.  
 82 ly opon and] lyopenand B.

- 85 Þe war leuer swelt vnder sword  
 Þan parti of þi peni hord ;  
 Þou wringest mani wrang word  
 Wiþ wanges ful wete ;  
 And deþ dinges o þi dore  
 90 Þat nedes schal be þi neizebore,  
 And fett þe to fen fore  
 Foule vnder fete,  
 For al þe craft þat þou can,  
 And al þe wele þatow wan,  
 95 Þe mock and þe mad man  
 No schul þai neuer mete !

## VII.

- Seþþ en font ous fra filþ wesche,  
 Our fa haue founde we our flesche,  
 Wiþ manifondinges and fresche  
 100 And foursum of fendes.  
 Is nan so þra of hem þre  
 Þat ma merres þan me.  
 Bisier mai nan be  
 To bring ous out bendes.  
 105 Man ! mene þou þi mis,  
 Trowe trustly on þis,  
 Þou no wat neuer ywis  
 In world whare þou wendes,  
 No wat gat þatow gas,  
 110 Þis four er redi on þi pas !  
 Now haue y founden þi fas,  
 Finde tow þi frendes !

- 91 fen fore] ten f(l)ore B.  
 98 founde] fonde T.  
 102 me] he K. (see Notes).  
 110 er] ar T.

## NOTES

Throughout the poem Turnbull writes *th* for *þ*, and regularly omits to notice abbreviations.

Kölbing, while committing only a few errors in transcription, makes abundant mistakes when quoting Turnbull's readings.

## Abbreviations

Eng. St. = *Englische Studien*.

Angl. = *Anglia*.

- l. 5 agas, *terrify*, cf. Gothic *usgaisjan*. Holthausen, Angl. 15, derives it from OE. *gan*. See Note, l. 71.

- l. 6 on *tas*. for *on* Kölbing, Eng. St. suggests *ous*, which Brown accepts. This would make *tas* a verb (ME. *tasen*, to tease); but if we read *tas* as a substantive (OFr. *tas*) the phrase, as it stands, makes quite good sense: "in a heap."
- l. 21 *kirt*, cf. ON. *kyrr* (adj.), *still, quiet*. Neut. *kyrt* used as an adv., *gently, quietly*.
- l. 29 *gentē*. MS. has a line over the final *e*, and a dot under *n*. Kölbing, Eng. St. 9, therefore emends to *geten*. This is probably correct, since the dot under the *n* would mean erasure, and the line over the *e* the abbreviation for *-n*.
- l. 30 "I consider it only a loaned gift."
- l. 34 Now cast, now couer. Kölbing, Eng. St. 9, translates "Bald werfen, bald sich (gegen einen wurf) schützen." But may not *couer* be the aphetic form of *acouer*, *recover*? See N.E.D. *couer* (2). The line would then read: "Now a throw, now a recovery," the figure of speech being taken from wrestling.
- l. 42 Now fals, now frou3. Holthausen, Angl. 15, considers *fals* a scribal error, and emends it to *fast*. The context certainly leads one to expect antithesis, but perhaps the scribe confused the correct phrase with the commoner *fals* and *fikel* or *fals* and *frou3*. It is quite possible that a proverbial tag like this would intrude unconsciously into the mind of the copyist.
- l. 43 *timeþ*. Kölbing, Turnbull and Brown read the MS. as *tirueþ*; and the first has emended it to *timeþ*. As no difference whatever exists between *u* and *n* in the book-hand of the MS. one can read either.
- l. 52 As fire dos in tunder. In order to make alliteration, Holthausen, Angl. 15, suggests *torche* for *fire*, but in so doing he misses the purport of the sentence. The author has mixed his similes a little. "Death," he says, "fells people when they fight against him as easily as fire flares up in tinder."  
Cf. Trevisa, "of a lytill sperkyll in an hepe of towe or of tyndyr cometh sodaynly a grete fyre."  
Like *fals* and *fikel*, *fire* and *tunder* was a common phrase. Besides, there is no example of ME. *torche* being used as Holthausen suggests.
- l. 53 letting at lite. Holthausen erroneously derives *lite* from OE. *wlitan*. Kölbing, Engl. St. 9, considers it an error of omission, but later, Engl. St. 19, describes it correctly as a Norse loan-word.  
*lite* has its equivalent in ON. *hlitan*, to trust, or wait for. This derivation is confirmed here by the use of *at* for *to*, *at* being the ON. preposition corresponding to OE. *to* (infin.).  
Hence the meaning is: "There is no hindrance to trust, or rely upon."
- l. 54 *tittes til him tite*. MS. *tittes*, but neither Kölbing nor Holthausen considers this correct. Holthausen, Angl. 15, substitutes *tittes* (= overthrows), but, as Kölbing points out, this fits neither



the context nor the syntax. Kölbing, Eng. St. 9, emends it to *tilles* (= reaches, extends). There is, however, a ME. verb *titten*, meaning to tug, snatch at, and it is still used in Modern Scots (see *N.E.D. tittes*). If the MS. reading be kept, the sense is clear, and quite in keeping with the homely expression of the rest of the poem. "That he does not snatch (to himself) quickly."

*tite*, ON. *titt* (often).

1. 56 sone. Brown has mistaken, I think, s for l.

1. 57 stokes. The meaning is clearly *thrusts at, stabs*; but Kölbing, Eng. St. 9, sees a difficulty in accepting this as the correct word. He thinks that from the context we should expect a verb expressing the reverse of *stabs*, and so suggest a word like *slakes*. But he himself sees the futility of the suggestion, for the form required would be *slokes*, which is unexampled; and in addition to this, the alliteration would be spoiled.

If ll. 57-60 are read as one sentence, there seems to be no reason for either altering *stokes* or cavilling at its meaning: "He (death) neither restrains (himself) nor stabs (*i.e.* cleanly), but always pricks and goads, until he unlocks all the locks under which life lies."

1. 71 For non giftes þat ges. "For no gifts that go," *i.e.* death will not give peace to any one, for no present in the world!"

Holthausen, Angl. 15, prefers to regard *ges* as a scribal error for *grees*, adding that *ges*, if from OE. *gan*, should have been *gas* to correspond with the forms of that verb in l. 5 (see note) and l. 109.

It is by no means unusual in ME. to find different forms of the same verb in a single poem. The meaning, too, is not so good, if we read *grees*.

For the idiomatic use of *go*, see *N.E.D. go*.

1. 73 has he fot, cf. *Merchant of Venice*, I, iii. 119-120: "And foot me as you spurn a stranger cur over your threshold."

1. 74 put þe pouer to þe pot. *Pot* here is probably the North. form of *pott*, meaning a *pit* or a *hole*. It is still used in North. and Scots dialect.

Cf. Dunbar, "In the depest pot of hell . . ."

See *N.E.D.*, *pot* subs. (2).

Holthausen's suggestion that it is the idiomatic phrase *put to pot*, *i.e.* ruined (cf. Mod. slang, *go to pot*) is less likely to be correct.

1. 77 Derne deþ vpon þe 3ong. Kölbing, Eng. St. 9, translates "Tod (der du dich) heimtückisch auf die jugend stürzest," ostensibly to account for *derne* as an adv. and *3ong*, meaning *youth*. But if we read *3ong* meaning *road*, or *pathway* (OE. *gang*, ME. *3ong*, Modern Scots. and N. of England, *gong*) and retain *derne* as an adj. (see l. 49) there will be no necessity to understand a verb, and the meaning will be a little clearer.

"Malicious death, it is difficult to struggle against thee on the road!" (*i.e.* of life).

- l. 82 *ly opon* and. Brown converts these three words into a pres. part *lyopenand* (= entrusting, fr. infin. lippen); and reads *open* for *opon*. MS. reads *ly opon* &. It is doubtful whether the scribe would have used such an abbreviation for the pres. part. inflection in this way. The other poems in the MS., which are in the same handwriting, show practically no use of abbreviations. The form of the pres. part. here also needs explanation beside the infin.
- l. 91 *fen fore*. Brown reads *ten* for *fen* and, at K. Sisam's suggestion, amends *fore* to *f[ɪ]ore*. It is perhaps easier to retain the MS. reading, and take *fore* = OE. *fōr*, a journey, "the fen journey" (*i.e.* the journey of death), since the fens were commonly associated with evil and death.
- l. 95 *ȝe mock* and *ȝe mad man*. This is the most obscure line in the poem. Holthausen, *Angl.* 15, reading *ȝe mock* as *mockery*, and *ȝe mad man* as NE. *madman*, has translated literally "der spott und der wahnsinnige, werden sie sich nie begegnen?" adding the explanation that mockery always overtakes the madman in this world. The weakness of this interpretation is readily apparent; the sentence as it stands need not have the meaning which Holthausen gives it in his explanation.

It is much better to understand *mock* as a form of ME. *muck*, meaning *money* (cf. *Modern Staffs.* and *Lincs. moock*, also meaning *money*), although the spelling *mock* is recorded nowhere else. The usual ME. forms were *muck*, *muk*, or *mok*. Kölbing, after Hall, gives *mock* this meaning, but with regard to *mad*, he appears to have confused it with *mat*, corresponding to modern *matt* (lustreless), and given it the meaning of an obsolete word *mad*, meaning *dazed*, *stupefied*. Then, without further explanation, he translates: "der reichthum und der leblose mann werden nie wieder zusammenkommen."

But there are no grounds for translating either *mat* or the obsolete *mad* as *dead* in the literal sense, and as applied to a human.

A meaning of *mad* which Kölbing has overlooked is, *infatuated*, *dotingly fond of*; cf. *Modern dancing mad* (see *N.E.D.*, *mad*, adj.). If we accept this in the present case, perhaps the meaning of the line will be a little clearer:

"(When) death knocks upon thy door . . .

. . . . .  
in spite of all the skill thou knowest,  
and all the goods that thou hast won,  
the money and the miser (the man *mad* for money)  
will never meet."

- l. 102 me. Kölbing's emendation to *he* makes much better sense.  
l. 104 out. Holthausen, Angl. 13, suggests *into* ; Kölbing, Eng. St. 9,  
*in*. In the MS. the *t* has been written above the *ou* or *on*.  
Perhaps the scribe copied *on* for *in*, and then mistook the  
*on* for *ou* and so added a *t*.  
l. 110 redi. Holthausen, Angl. 15, suggests *frecli* to make alliteration,  
but such emendations are to be deprecated. They undermine  
the value of research, and are totally unnecessary. The  
annotator is not justified in correcting the poet !

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### THE INFLUENCE OF BOCCACCIO ON HAWES'S *PASTIME OF PLEASURE*

It has been asserted<sup>1</sup> that the principal source of Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure* is Lydgate's *Court of Sapience*, and it is obvious that the *Romance of the Rose* also influenced the poem; but neither of these works accounts for the singular figure of La Belle Pucelle. What sort of maiden is this with whose famed beauty Graunde Amoure falls in love? The road to her heart leads through a complete course of studies, and even in the hour of parting she points inexorably upward to "the royall tower of Morall Document." The *Pastime of Pleasure* offers us not the familiar spectacle of a man conducted on an academic Cook's Tour by a supernatural being, but the decidedly unusual one of a mediæval lover inspired to intellectual and moral self-improvement by a woman. We are reminded of Dante and Beatrice; and with good reason, for La Belle Pucelle and much else besides in Hawes' allegory become clearly intelligible when we turn to the curious poem in which Boccaccio sought to blend recollections of the *Romance of the Rose*, the *Divine Comedy*, and the *Vita Nuova*, with the ever-present memory of his beloved Mary of Aquino. I refer to the *Amorosa Visione*.

In the Italian poem as in the English, the hero is confronted with the problem of choosing his path in life,<sup>2</sup> is advised by a queenly personage,<sup>3</sup> reads two inscriptions,<sup>4</sup> and is determined in his choice by that which promises love and worldly success.<sup>5</sup> Like Graunde Amoure, he enters a hall on the walls of which are represented the satisfactions and the trials attendant on the course he proposes to

<sup>1</sup> E. A. Burkhart, *Stephen Hawes's Pastime of Pleasure*. London, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> *Pastime*, 99-112; *Amorosa Visione*, I-III.

<sup>3</sup> P. 155-315; *A.V.* I. 1-50.

<sup>4</sup> P. 80-98; *A.V.* II 64-67; III 16-21.

<sup>5</sup> P. 99-112; *A.V.* III 21 to close.

follow;<sup>1</sup> and in a second hall he beholds a picture of Fortune<sup>2</sup> and hears that goddess severely judged.<sup>3</sup> Still like Graunde Amoure, he enters a garden,<sup>4</sup> and, while his adviser waits for him,<sup>5</sup> declares his love to a lady<sup>6</sup> with whom he is suddenly smitten. As in the *Pastime of Pleasure*, there is a sorrowful parting<sup>7</sup> when the beloved maiden insists that her lover return to his guide<sup>8</sup> (whom here also she meets)<sup>9</sup> and that he make the toilsome ascent of the tower of self-improvement.<sup>10</sup> In the *Amorosa Visione* as in the *Pastime of Pleasure*, the author closes begging the reader to correct any mistakes which may occur in the poem.<sup>11</sup>

The parallelism noted above extends to details, as may be seen in the following:

*Amorosa Visione*

IV 10. The first hall entered by the hero is painted blue.

XXXI 73. Fortune is called "a mere name."

XXXVIII 55. Fortune is represented with three faces.

XXXVIII 79. The hero beholds a fountain fed by three figures standing on a column in the midst. The fountain has four figures at the corners (40). It overflows in three streams (XXXIX).

XLVI 50. The heroine asks her lover how he came into the garden; he tells her about his guide, and a meeting between the two follows.

*Pastime of Pleasure*

433. The tapestry in the first hall entered by Graunde Amoure is "imbrodred all in blew."

3207-8. Fortune is called a figure of speech.

3036. Fortune has "two faces in one hode."

388-93. Graunde Amoure beholds a fountain fed by four figures "on the toppe" (6). The fountain overflows in four streams (4. 1).

2325-61. La Belle Pucelle asks her lover how he came to meet his guide; he tells her how he was led to her, and a meeting follows.

So much to prove that Hawes was indebted to the *Amorosa Visione*. We now understand his curiously awkward anticipation of events in the tapestry of lines 412-476. In the Italian poem the pictures are an organic part of the plot. Boccaccio (for he speaks in his own person) has chosen the worldly way against the strenuous opposition

<sup>1</sup> P. 412-476; A.V. IV, XXX.

<sup>2</sup> P. 3193-3220; A.V. XXXI-XXXIV.

<sup>3</sup> P. 2326; A.V. XL.

<sup>4</sup> P. 2367-2408; A.V. XLVII 1-9.

<sup>5</sup> P. 2325-2362; A.V. XLVIII.

<sup>6</sup> P. 5796-5802; A.V. L 55-57.

<sup>7</sup> P. 3034-3036; A.V. XXXI.

<sup>8</sup> P. 1976-2030; A.V. XXXVIII.

<sup>9</sup> P. 2052-2261; A.V. XLVI.

<sup>10</sup> P. 2360-2366; A.V. XLVI 67-75.

<sup>11</sup> P. 2363-2364; A.V. XLVI 70-73.

of the queenly personage,<sup>1</sup> who probably stands for reason and worthy ambition; <sup>2</sup> and the paintings are repeatedly and all but successfully used by his mentor as illustrations of her warnings.<sup>3</sup> We are evidently to understand that until he met his love the author persisted in his errors despite reason and experience. When his baffled well-wisher meets the other, she at once and joyfully delivers him to her care,<sup>4</sup> and greets her as one almost divine.<sup>5</sup> But the beloved damsel presently commands him to make the probationary ascent under his former guide: <sup>6</sup> she can inspire him to noble exertion, even as divine grace inspires; but he must exert himself as a free agent. The thing is interesting, because, so far as I know, we have here the first appearance in English literature of that curious combination of Aristotelian metaphysics, Christian piety, and earthly love—the ideal woman conceived of by the poets of the "sweet new style" and immortalised by Dante.

Hawes's indebtedness to Boccaccio is not limited to the *Amorosa Visione*. His defence of poetry in Canto IX is closely similar to that in Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*, and the following parallel proves, I think, that the resemblance is not accidental:

*Pastime of Pleasure, 792-805*

But rude people, opprest with  
blyndnes,  
Agaynst your fables wyll often  
solisgyse  
Such is theyr mynde, such is theyr  
folyshnes;  
For they beleve in no maner of  
wyse  
That under a colour a trouthe may  
aryse,  
For folysh people, blynded in a  
matter,  
Will often erre whan they of it do  
clatter.  
O all ye cursed and such evyll  
fooes,  
Whose syghtes be blynded over  
all with foly,

*Geneal. Deorum, XIV*

There are those who, without any authority, are not ashamed to say that it is folly to believe that the poets concealed any symbolical meaning in their fables. On the contrary, the poets composed such things merely to display their skill, and the ignorant were entrapped into accepting lies for the truth. Oh iniquity of men! O stupid wickedness! Who but ignoramuses would say that the poets composed mere fables devoid of inner meaning? . . . If they are troubled with this lust of being thought learned, let them enter the schools, let them listen to precepts, let them turn over books, let them see and learn. . . . When they

<sup>1</sup> *A.V.* I 49-53; II and III 1-20.

<sup>2</sup> *A.V.* XXX-XXXVIII.

<sup>3</sup> *A.V.* XLVIII 38-40.

<sup>4</sup> *A.V.* I 69; II 60.

<sup>5</sup> *A.V.* XLVIII 40 *et seq.*

<sup>6</sup> *A.V.* L 1-46.



*Pastime of Pleasure, 792-805**Geneal. Deorum, XIV*

Open your eyes in the plesaunt  
 schools  
 Of perfit connyng, or that you  
 reply  
 Agaynst fables for to be contrary ;  
 For lack of connyng no mervayle  
 though you erre,  
 In such science, whych is from you  
 so far.

have done so, and earned the noble  
 title, then, if they please, let them  
 criticise.

The Johns Hopkins University.

C. W. LEMMI.

### THE TYPOGRAPHY OF THE ACT-HEADINGS OF THE FIRST FOLIO

At this time when the problem of the act- and scene-division in the plays of Shakespeare is being discussed in *The Review of English Studies*, it may be of interest to inquire as to the method employed by Jaggard's journeymen in composing the act-headings of the First Folio. The following remarks are supplementary to a note upon "The Heading, *Actus Primus, Scæna Prima*, in the First Folio" which appeared in July 1928 in this *Review* (iv. 323-6).

The act-headings of the First Folio may be divided into two classes which differ considerably in their typographical treatment. The first, the headings for Act I, as we have previously found, have three marked characteristics :

(1) They appear in the centre of the first page of every play, immediately after the title, although six of the plays have no act-divisions.

(2) They fall into successive series, the regularity of which results from the fact that Jaggard's compositors repeatedly used the same setting of type and quads to print the captions for sequential plays.

(3) They were printed, with three exceptions, in the order in which they appear in the bound folio.

The second class of captions, the headings for Acts II, III, IV, and V, on the other hand, stand in contrast to those for Act I on the following points :

(1) They extend only across a column, surrounded by the text of those plays which have act-headings.

(2) They differ widely in spelling, punctuation, capitalisation and in the use of the swash letter, and seem, as they now appear in the folio, to bear no typographical relation to one another.

(3) They were not printed in the order in which they are now read. The first and twelfth pages of each quire, for instance, were regularly printed from the same forme. As a result, the heading for the fourth act of a play was sometimes printed before that of the second act.

Obviously, then, the first step in an attempt to study the headings for Acts II-V is to arrange these captions in the approximate order in which they were printed.<sup>1</sup> When this is done it will be found that these headings group themselves into a number of easily recognised series, and that each caption differs from the other members of its series only in that the adjective modifying *Actus* is changed to correspond to the number of the act which it heads. Knowing as we do the method by which Jaggard's journeymen composed the headings for Act I, we can at once deduce that, except for the changes as to the adjective indicating the number of the act, all the captions which compose a true series were printed from the same setting of type and quads.

Fortunately we are able to test the validity of our hypothesis. The logotype "*us*" is found but nine times in the captions of the first Folio and each time as part of the word *Actus* which, modified by the appropriate adjective, appears on the following signatures: H2<sup>r</sup>, I4<sup>v</sup>, K1<sup>r</sup>, K5<sup>r</sup>, K3<sup>v</sup>, L5<sup>r</sup>, N2<sup>v</sup>, O1<sup>r</sup>, P5<sup>v</sup>. Or again, in a series of headings of four words each (*Actus* ——. *Scena Prima*, and the appropriate adjective) there appears (on sigs. C6<sup>v</sup>, D6<sup>v</sup>, D4<sup>r</sup>, E5<sup>v</sup>, E3<sup>r</sup>, F2<sup>v</sup>, G2<sup>r</sup>, G4<sup>r</sup>, H6<sup>v</sup>) a damaged "*a*" at the end of *Prima*. This typographical evidence, too complex to be the result of chance, is, we believe, sufficient to prove the correctness of our deduction.

It must not be hastily assumed, however, that all the headings for Acts II-V which (except for adjective variation) are superficially alike, were printed from the same setting of type. The fallacy of such an assumption may be seen by the fact that in several cases act-headings similar in spelling, punctuation and capitalisation were printed from the same forme.

To sum up, then, the journeymen who composed the text of the first Folio merely left room for the captions, which were set in a

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the order of printing, see R. B. McKerrow, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (Oxford, 1927), pp. 25-27.

larger size of type. Later, and, it would seem, usually immediately before the page was printed, the headings were inserted. After the forme was taken from the press, the types for the captions were lifted out before the text-type was distributed. If act-headings were needed for subsequent pages, necessary changes were made with regard to the adjective signifying the number of the act, and with this modification the same setting of type was inserted into another forme. Needless to say, this operation was frequently interrupted by accident.

The use of this labour-saving device in Jaggard's shop was, we believe, the cause of most of the irregularities which occur in the headings for Acts II-V. The fact that the form of heading which contains the words, *Scæna Prima*, is found in plays that have no scene-divisions may be explained by this mechanical method of composition. Again, it is evident that upon one occasion the caption, *Actus Quartus, Scæna Prima*, was lifted out of the forme which had printed sig. b1<sup>r</sup> and then without change inserted into the forme for sig. b3<sup>v</sup> to head Act v. The same imperfect "Q" appears in both captions. Our knowledge, however, that this method of composition was employed does not aid us in determining the cause of the only other case of misnomination of an act. In this place also *Quartus* appears instead of *Quintus* in the heading for Act v (sig. M2<sup>r</sup>).

This method of composition, again, cannot account for the use of feminine adjectives to modify *Actus* (sigs. L3<sup>v</sup>, T1<sup>v</sup>, cc6<sup>r</sup>). For this, however, the explanation is easy. The mistake occurs only in the shorter form (*Actus* and the adjective), and the compositor habituated through the printing of the scene-heading to make the adjective member of a two-word caption feminine thus committed this error.<sup>1</sup>

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY.

The Newberry Library, Chicago.

#### THE AUTHORSHIP OF *A FOUREFOLD MEDITATION*

In the *Summary Catalogue of Western MSS.*, in the Bodleian, item 14710 (Vol. III, p. 331) is given as :

<sup>1</sup> To modify *Actus* with a feminine adjective was not an unusual error. In *The Two Italian Gentlemen* ([ca. 1585], Malone Soc., No. 15), for instance, *Actus* is consistently treated as feminine.

<sup>1</sup> (fol. 1) title on a detached slip, "A poeme of the contempte of the world and an exhortacion to prepare to dye, made by Phillipe earle of Arundell after his attaynder" beg. "O wretched man which lovest earthly things" 126—6 line—stanzas.

In Vol. IV of the catalogue, p. xi, "Corrections, etc.," there is this item:

14710, art. 1. This is perhaps by R. Southwell, not the earl of Arundell.

The poem was reprinted by Charles Edmonds in 1895 as *A Foure-fold Meditation by Robert Southwell, S.J.*<sup>1</sup>

What is the evidence for ascribing it to Southwell? There are four MSS. of the poem:

- (1) MS. Rawl., poet, 219 (described above—item 14710 in Bodleian catalogue).
- (2) MS. Tanner 118, fol. 44 (see *Catalogus Codicum MSS. Bibl. Bodl.*, pars. iv, p. 495).
- (3) Crowcombe Court MS. (see *Hist. MS. Commission Report IV*, p. 372).
- (4) Oscott College MS. (see Edmonds' edition of *A Foure-fold Meditation*, pp. viii-x).

One imperfect copy, which contains only sheet B of a printed edition, is in the British Museum; it is here entitled, *A Foure-Fould Meditation of the foure last things . . . composed in a Divine Poeme by R.S. The Author of S. Peters Complaint. Imprinted at London by G. Eld; for Francis Burton, 1606.* The dedication is in these words: "To the Right Worshipfull and Vertuous Gentleman, Matthew Saunders, Esquire. W.H. wisheth, with long life, a prosperous achievement of his good desires." And the preface, signed W.H., contains this sentence, "Long have they lien hidden in obscuritie, and happily had never seene the light, had not a mere accident conveyed them to my hands." Now, W.H. is very probably the same W.H. who was the "onlie begetter" of Shakespeare's Sonnets, which were printed, like this poem, by G. Eld.

Sir Sidney Lee identified this W.H. with William Hall, and Mr. A. W. Pollard accepts this identification.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Similarly in *The Year's Work in English Studies* (1926), p. 163, a plea is made for a new edition of Southwell, which will contain this poem "of which Grosart never seems to have heard."

<sup>2</sup> Both Lee (*Life of Shakespeare*, 1925, p. 681) and Pollard (*Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, 1917, p. 32) note the pirated nature of this edition though both accept Southwell's authorship of the poem.

The *Foure-fold Meditation* was therefore given to the world by an unscrupulous stationer who unblushingly admitted that his edition was pirated, and even sought commendation for that very reason. He ascribed it to Robert Southwell, a notorious Jesuit, whose literary work was famous and much applauded.

To whom do the MSS. ascribe the poem? MS. Rawl. poet., 219, states that its author was "Phillippe, Earle of Arundell," and that it was composed "after his attaynder." The Crowcombe MS. also gives it to Arundel, and dates it Christmas 1587 at Westminster, whither Arundel was taken from the Tower. This MS. also contains a copy of a Letter to Queen Elizabeth, "written by the Earle of Arundell," and his translation of Book III of Johan Justus Lansperger's *liber alloquiorum Jesu Christi ad quamvis animam*, which was published at Antwerp in 1595. The poem is anonymous in MS. Tanner 118, which is a collection of Catholic poetry and records, and also in the Oscott MS.

Two of the four MSS. thus ascribe the poem to Arundel; one of these two contains other works certainly by the Earl; none suggests any other author. Why did "W.H." ascribe it to "R.S. the author of *St. Peter's Complaint*"? His aim was very obviously to secure a large circulation for the poem, and increase his profits.<sup>1</sup> By 1606 the memory of Arundel would almost be forgotten. Not so that of Southwell, whose works were still popular. Editions of *Mary Magdalens Teares* appeared in 1602, 1607, 1609, of *St. Peters Complaynt with other Poems* in 1600 and 1602; and even in 1615, twenty years after his execution, there appeared an edition of his works.

The style of *A Foure-fold Meditation* has none of the fair and flagrant things which have made famous Southwell's poems. That is a fact which must be considered by those who would cling to Southwell's authorship of the poem. Had "W.H." published it as by its real author, Philip Howard, first Earl of Arundel, it might have—deservedly—fallen still-born from the press.

H. J. L. ROBBIE.

<sup>1</sup> The 1595 edition of *Mæonia*, which is undoubtedly genuine, is stated to be "composed by R. S."

SUPERLATIVE ADJECTIVES FORMED FROM  
SUBSTANTIVES

It is recognised that English writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries often used substantives as adjectives, for example, Shakespeare in "The honey of his *music* vows."

It has perhaps not been noticed that they sometimes form superlatives from substantives, some of which they would probably not use as adjectives in the positive degree. I have collected the following examples:

*beautiest*: Michael Cavendish, Morley's *Triumphs of Oriana*, No. XI (1601), "the beautiest of the beauties."

*childest*: *Club Law*, l. 139 (written 1599): "methinks it is the Childest thinge to be breched."

*harlottryest*: [Chapman?] *Charlemagne or the Distracted Emperor*, II. i. 313 (? written 1598-1599): "This vertue is the scurvyest, harlottryest undoeinge thing."

*hazardest*: Sir Henry Wotton, letter of January 12, 1614/5 (*Life and Letters*, ii, 68): "the hazardest point."

*majestiest*: Mathew Stevenson, *Occasions Off-spring*, p. 110 (1645), "Reason swayes her majestiest sceptre there." (It is possible, of course, that we have here a misprint for "majesticst.")

*rubbishest*: Nashe, *Haue with you*, 1596 (*Works*, ed. McKerrow, iii, 108 bot.), "excrements of the rubbishest wits."

*savourest*: Dekker, *Honest Whore*, Pt. II, iv. 1, "the savourest meat."

*sugarest*: Dekker, *Honest Whore*, Pt. I, i. 1: "the sugarest delicious rogues."

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

## A FRAGMENT BY ADDISON

In a volume of correspondence of the Pelham family presented by the Earl of Chichester in 1888 to the British Museum there is to be found [Add. MS. 33,441, fols. 1, 1<sup>v</sup>, & 2] a prose fragment, not in



Addison's hand, which was, according to a note at the end, "Found in M<sup>r</sup>. Addison's Cabinet & suppos'd to be a Sketch of a Spectator upon Friendship."

Among the "manuscript materials collected and in great part written by Dr. Richard Rawlinson, towards a Continuation of Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* to 1750" a printed biographical notice of Addison [Bodl. MS. Rawl. J. 4º, I, fol. 462] is pasted on paper, on the back of which there appears in Rawlinson's hand the statement that in the thirty-fifth number of the *Universal Spectator*, and *Weekly Journal*, June 7, 1729, "was published a fragment on friendship by Mr. Addison never before printed."<sup>1</sup>

H. Baker, the author of the article in this issue of the *Universal Spectator*, chose friendship for his theme. In letter form he tells the story of Camilla and her disastrous experience, and follows this with an exposition of the "several useful Lessons for the Conduct of human Life" to be derived from the relation. Finally he says, "I cannot better finish this Discourse, or oblige my Readers more, than by saving from being lost a *Fragment* of the finest *Genius* of the Age, on *Friendship*," and prints the fragment in four paragraphs within quotation marks.

There seems to be no doubt that this is a genuine piece of Addison's work and should be so recognised; the theme is congenial, the use of Pliny characteristic, and the style not dissimilar. I am giving the version of the manuscript, which differs from that of the periodical only slightly and is less accessible.

In Pliny's Natural History we find a curious Receipt for making the Roman Friendships; a cordial that was universally esteem'd in those days, & very few families of any credit without it. Pliny says, that they were indebted to the Greeks for this receipt, who had it in the greatest perfection. The Old Roman Friendships were a composition of several ingredients, of w<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Principal was Union of Hearts (a fine Flower, w<sup>ch</sup> grew in several parts of that Empire;) Sincerity, Frankness, Disinterestedness, Pity, & tenderness, of each an equal quantity; these all mixed up together, w<sup>th</sup> two rich Oyls, w<sup>ch</sup> they call'd perpetual kind wishes, & serenity of temper, & the whole was strongly perfum'd w<sup>th</sup> the desire of

<sup>1</sup> In a companion volume [Bodl. MS. Rawl. J. 4º, II, fol. 273] Rawlinson inserted a clipping, from the *Whitehall Evening-Post*, No. 1007, Feb. 18-20, 1724-5, the Latin and English preamble to Lord Parker's patent, which is printed in the Bohn edition of Addison, vi. 604-6. This preamble, printed in a periodical years after Addison's death and Parker's elevation to the peerage but shortly before his disgrace, is introduced thus: "The following Preamble to the Patent of a Noble Peer, written by the late ingenious Mr. Addison, contains a character so amiable that it cannot be enough admir'd."

pleasing, w<sup>ch</sup> gave it a most gratefull Smell ; & was a sure restorative in all sorts of Vapours. The Cordial thus prepared, was of so durable a Nature that no length of time would waste it, & what is very remarkable, says our Author, it increas'd in Weight, & Value ; the longer you kept it.

The Moderns have most greatly adulterated this fine receipt ; some of the Ingredients, indeed, are not to be found, but what they impose upon you for friendship, is as follows, Outward Profession (a common Weed that grows every where) instead of the Flower of Union, y<sup>e</sup> desire of being pleas'd, a large quantity of self Interest, convenience, & Reservedness, many handfulls, a little of pity, & tenderness, (but some pretend to make it up without these two last) & the common Oyl of inconstancy, (w<sup>ch</sup> like our Linseed Oyl is cold drawn every Hour) serves to mix them all together ; most of these ingredients being of a perishable Nature, it will not keep, & shews it self to be a counterfeit by lessning continually in Weight & Value.

RICHMOND P. BOND.

## CORRESPONDENCE

HENRY CRABB ROBINSON

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

SIR,

I hope you will allow me to make a brief comment on Mr. Larg's article in your last issue, entitled *Henry Crabb Robinson and Mme. de Stael*. Every reader is, of course, entitled to make his own deductions from the available data, and, while I personally think that he has done Crabb Robinson considerably less than justice in the conclusions he reaches, partly because he appears not to have examined all the evidence, I do not propose to argue about his opinions.

But as one who has spent many years in a study of Crabb Robinson's diaries and correspondence, I feel constrained to protest vehemently against one of Mr. Larg's statements, viz. "He was not an articulate, self-explaining, self-examining man. There is no trace in his most secret papers of any private wrestling with his soul." The only adequate reply to this is a categorical denial of the assertion. Crabb Robinson's papers, published and unpublished, are full of philosophical and metaphysical debate and enquiry, and it may safely be assumed that there was no subject in which he evinced so much interest as in the "spiritual things" which, according to Mr. Larg, he ignored, in order to live "comfortably and amply at the general expense of the universe."

Such a statement is a mere travesty of fact, as even a consultation of Sadler's edition of the *Diary* may prove. For those of us who have gone further, it seems impossible to conceive anything less like the real person than the Crabb Robinson conjured up by Mr. Larg—a man undisturbed by the convulsions of revolutionary "romantic" and Godwinian thought, or by the new transcendental philosophy!

Yours faithfully,

EDITH J. MORLEY.

The University,  
Reading.

## REVIEWS

**The Pastime of Pleasure.** By STEPHEN HAWES, together with introduction, notes, glossary, and indexes by WILLIAM EDWARD MEAD, Ph.D. Early English Text Society. Vol. 173. Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. cxiii+259. 15s. net.

THE publication of a new edition of *The Pastime of Pleasure* is to be welcomed, for hitherto the poem has ranked among those works of our literature which are frequently discussed, but seldom read. There has been some excuse for this—apart from the forbidding nature of much of its subject-matter—for copies of this poem have been hard to come by outside the great libraries. In 1831 Southey included the text of 1554 in his *Select Works of British Poets*, and in 1845 Thomas Wright edited the 1555 text for the Percy Society, but both these books are now scarce; and, since Wright's edition, students for the most part have been content with extracts published in anthologies. Now Dr. Mead has wisely gone back to the earliest complete text, and has given us an exact reprint (though not in black-letter) of the Pierpont Morgan copy of W. de Worde's edition of 1517. Hence for the first time the student can examine at his leisure the poem as it appeared while Hawes was still alive, the proof-sheets of which, Dr. Mead hazards, "not impossibly may have been examined by the author himself."

The neglect of this poem is not entirely due to its rarity, for it must be confessed to be a depressing specimen of fifteenth-century versifying. Its interest is mainly to be sought in its desperate attempt to give new life to two out-moded and decaying expressions of mediæval thought—chivalry and scholasticism. Hawes obstinately clings to both these things, although he writes after the Wars of the Roses, and in the first great days of the New Learning. In his long Introduction Dr. Mead has given a good survey of the fifteenth century and the place Hawes occupies in it; a section on grammar and metre, and another on the literary traits of the

poem. The question of the sources of the poem receives considerable attention, but little new emerges. It is true that Hawes was a learned man; but his learning was, in the main, the conventional learning of one versed in scholastic philosophy. This was a common possession of the Middle Ages, and came to be summarised conveniently in several well-known encyclopedias. Whether Hawes is mainly indebted to one or the other of these seems of small moment unless we can show that he made some special and characteristic use of them. Unfortunately Hawes uses his materials—whatever their *provenance*—in a most uninspired manner, and all Dr. Mead's elaborate disquisition does not advance us far beyond the writings of Natter and Burkart, although we agree that he has established a firmer (and an independent) case for the view held by Natter that Hawes was influenced by the *Margarita Philosophica* of the Carthusian friar Reisch. The question we should have liked to have seen treated at length is that of the relation between *The Pastime* and *The Court of Sapience*. Dr. Mead says that Hawes "appears to have derived hints for a portion of the plan of *The Pastime*" from *The Court*, but beyond this and a few references in his notes he does not explore this problem. We know that *The Court* was familiar to Hawes (who indeed thought it the work of Lydgate, see line 1357), and there are similarities of vocabulary and syntax in the two poems. A careful investigation of these matters conceivably would have been more fruitful than a further probing of the scholastic materials Hawes used.

With regard to the text and textual apparatus, Dr. Mead writes: "The present edition offers, along with the earliest complete text, variant readings from the fragmentary copy of the edition of 1509 and from the editions of 1554 and 1555. In selecting the various readings I have endeavoured to take account of everything significant, such as the actual substitution of one word for another, but not of mere variant spellings" (Preface, p. vi). An examination of the text of this edition does not altogether bear out this claim. To take some examples: in line 267, "But *behonde* them" reads in the 1554 edition *beyonde*; in line 721, *fantasy* appears in 1554 as *fansy*; in line 772, *fables* appears in 1554 as *fable*; in line 1361, *for woman* appears in 1554 as *for a woman*; in line 1386 *haue fame for* appears in 1554 as *haue for*, etc. None of these variants are noted by Dr. Mead; yet, on the other hand, despite his disclaimer, the editor has included a great many variants which are merely slight differences of

spelling, e.g. lines 1577, 1580, 1625, 1637, etc. These could have been spared for the sake of the more important variants; for the discovery that we have only a selection leaves us with a feeling of insecurity. The Glossary also suffers from the same defect. We are not told whether it is inclusive or no: for instance, the word *aromatyke* is glossed as occurring twice (822, 923) whereas there are at least three other references to it (67, 396, 671); *doultance* has only two entries instead of seven, while the occurrence of many words is fully recorded. Dr. Mead also notes that the Glossary "has presented some difficulty, since it contains a number of words not found in the Oxford Dictionary." But are such words as *depared* and *nyally* really new words? *Depured* is one of the commonest of Lydgate's words, and actually occurs in *The Pastime* at least four times. When we read *depared* in line 1320, is it not merely an error of the printers, only needing correction? Similarly, in line 1342, the word *nyally* would seem to be a misprint for *ryally*. Certainly the significance of the phrase *full nyally* is difficult to grasp in the context.

There are few misprints: Mr. A. F. Schofield's initials are wrongly given on p. viii, as are Dr. J. M. Manly's on p. cxii, while line 4453 should read 4455. And is it safe at this time of day to base an argument concerning Lydgate's descriptive powers on *London Lickpenny*?

H. S. BENNETT.

**Mediaeval Plays in Scotland.** Thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph.D. of the University of St. Andrews, July 1924. By ANNA JEAN MILL, M.A. (St. Andrews University Publications, No. XXIV.) Oxford University Press.<sup>1</sup> 1927. Pp. vii+356. 10s. net.

MISS MILL has carried out an interesting and difficult piece of research, and is to be congratulated not merely on the care with which she has investigated an immense quantity of scattered material, but on the order which she has brought out of confusion and the common sense and moderation which she shows in dealing with

<sup>1</sup> By an error the book has the name of the printers, Messrs. William Blackwood & Sons, Ltd., as publishers.



doubtful questions. She is compelled, owing to the paucity of early records, to draw most of her evidence from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but with that limitation she is able to give examples of most forms of early drama. She begins with a brief survey of Folk Plays, deliberately ignoring modern survivals and confining herself to evidence of existence in the Middle Ages and survival through the Reformation period. The Yule pastimes, the election of the King of the Bean—of which she finds evidence at St. Andrews as early as 1432—and of the Boy Bishop, the May games, can all be traced in burgh and kirk session records, and she adds sometimes amusing evidence with regard to the changing status of the participants. The Abbot of Unreason, the Lord of Bonaccord, or Robin Hood, was at first a substantial citizen, and in many towns, as at Aberdeen, an official responsible for the "halding of ye guid touñ in glaidnes and blythnes with dans/s fars/s playis & gamis in tymes convenient," and it was only the troubles, civil and religious, of the mid-sixteenth century which led to the discrediting of both the games and the office. The difficulty, as Miss Mill admits, is to be sure how far these "plays," even the Robin Hood plays, were formal dramatic pieces, and how far they were more or less improvised. In her consideration of minstrels and minstrelsy she adduces evidence in support of Sir E. K. Chambers's theory of "the complete fourfold equivalence of *ioculator*, *ministrallus*, *mimus*, and *histrion*," and is able to draw the inference that "statements . . . to the effect that professional stage-players or companies were in the regular pay of the Scottish court from an early date must be accepted with reserve." This leads to a discussion of court revels, mumblings and disguisings, with some evidence of the provision of scenic equipment. The court mask appears early; but one may perhaps query the suggestion (p. 48) that the spectre of Death which interrupted the "*choream militarem*" at the marriage banquet of Alexander III was part of the entertainment: the tone of Fordun's comment indicates a portent rather than a scene which was afterwards recognised as ironically significant. In the more certain instances of court masks Miss Mill cautiously notes that "no one instance clearly shows all the features", but points out that the features can be put together from the descriptions of various functions. Of the "truncated masks adapted to meet the needs of a banquet" the most striking in its medley of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and unconscious comedy is that performed at the

baptismal feast of Prince Henry at Stirling in 1594 (pp. 50-52), with its excellent climax, when was sung "with most delicate dulce voices, and sweet harmonie, in seven partes, the 128th Psalm, with fourteen voyces." In comparison with this the "disguisings" and dramatic elements in tournaments are dull things. Miss Mill finds no real parallel in the Scottish records to the influence exerted in England on stage plays through the activities of the Chapel Royal, though she has some interesting notes on the dramatic work of Patrick Johnson, who may have been a Clerk of the Chapel. In considering municipal plays, she finds few traces of liturgical drama and little definite evidence as to the exact nature of miracle plays and religious pageants. There was a Corpus Christi play, apparently with speeches, at Aberdeen in the mid-fifteenth century, but there is no evidence of cycles or of organised "craft" plays, and the Corpus Christi "pageants" may have been dumb shows. Perth appears to have had a strong dramatic tradition, but in most towns there may have been nothing more than a procession with Biblical characters. In this section of the subject the data are more than usually scanty, confused, and difficult to interpret, and Miss Mill shows a wise caution in making only tentative suggestions. "Clerks' plays" may also have been on religious subjects, "Interlude" is used very vaguely, and a "Farce" seems commonly to have been a spectacular entertainment. A royal entry to a burgh was celebrated with these or other shows of a more or less dramatic kind.

All the promise of development in these dramatic and semi-dramatic productions was blighted by the Reformation; for, though the earlier Reformers were not on principle opposed to plays and even saw their value for purposes of propaganda, yet, in Miss Mill's words (p. 95), "the suppression of feast days traditionally associated with dramatic performances, the absolute prohibition of Sunday plays, limitations as to subject-matter, and a slavish acceptance of the Deuteronomic law regarding disguisings, a rigid censorship—all these restraints were bound to militate against the preservation and stimulation of the drama." James VI welcomed English players, and established a "pastyme hous" in Edinburgh in 1599, but this was an exotic experiment, blighted in its turn by his removal to London a few years later. The Scottish drama survived only, and then under severe discouragement, in folk plays.

Miss Mill adds to the value of her thesis by appending, with some annotations, the evidence, much of it hitherto unprinted, on

which her work is based. Her investigations were carried out and their publication made possible with the help of the Carnegie Trust, which can seldom have aided a more conscientious piece of scholarship.

EDITH C. BATHO.

**Studien zu Chaucer und Langland.** By FRITZ KROG. Anglistische Forschungen herausgegeben von Dr. JOHANNES HOOPS. Heft 65. Heidelberg: Carl Winter. 1928. Pp. xii+174. 9 Mk.

THE subject of this book is a study of Chaucer and Langland on the lines of modern psychological methods. According to Dr. Krog, Chaucer, living in a time of transition while the feudal system was breaking up before the attacks of the rising middle class, and Catholic orthodoxy was assailed by Wiclif, suffered throughout his life from a profound disunion of spirit. Standing apart from all the great movements of the time, with no message to his fellow-men such as Langland had, he used his art as a means of escape from reality. He lost his true home by passing from the bourgeoisie into the society of the aristocracy, and his courtly poems are expressed in the idiom and coloured with the melancholy of a dying culture. It should here be noted that Chaucer's fondness for the words "sadness" and "sad" cannot be taken, as they are by Dr. Krog on p. 58, to illustrate any pathetic melancholy of Chaucer's early work; they do not denote sorrow, but simply steadfastness, seriousness. Hesitating between faith and reason, and deprived of a sure foundation in the class from which he sprang, in which respects he is interestingly compared with the exiled Petrarch, Chaucer fell into pessimism, and his religious faith was weakened to a "pious pathos." Finally, with the loss of court favour he experienced in his last period, he turned to English middle-class subjects; and here his disunited nature is still shown when realism becomes caricature, as in the talk of the Wife of Bath, the Pardoner, and the Canon's Yeoman.

In order to trace the psychological development of William Langland, we must first establish the chronological order of his works. Dr. Krog therefore devotes nearly all the latter part of his book to a refutation of the theory put forward by Dr. Gertrud Görnemann that the three versions of *Piers Plowman* are indepen-

dently descended through scribal variations from one original version. Against Dr. Görnemann's assertion of a connection between A and C which is independent of B, he analyses the variations in C. Passus xi, where two versions agree against the third, classifying them as far as possible according to their origin with the author or a scribe. The twelve cases in which he finds that A and C agree against B he attributes to mistakes on the part of an early B-scribe. Two of these may be noted. In C xi, 28 two words are omitted in B, but it should be observed that they are also omitted in MS. U of the A-version. In C xi. 76, A and C. do not agree. The three versions are :

A. "Dowel, quod he, and Dobet and Dobest the thridde."

B. "Dowel and Dobet and Dobest the thridde, quod he."

C. "Dowel and Dobet, quath he, and Dobest the thridde."

The order in B, probably arising from a correction being made in the margin and then inserted in the wrong place, is unmetrical ; and the line in C suggests rather a correction of B than derivation from A through an uncorrupted B.

MABEL DAY.

Sir John Cheke und der englische Humanismus. Von Dr. WALTER L. NATHAN. Bonn : Rhenania-Verlag. Pp. 106.

THIS careful account of the life and work of Cheke is a contribution to the history of the English Renaissance not to be neglected by students of the movement.

Cheke was probably a greater man than we commonly judge. He was little more than twenty when he and his coeval Thomas Smith introduced the Erasmian pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge, the innovation which he afterwards defended with ability in his correspondence with Gardiner. His appointment as first Regius Professor of Greek in 1540 was followed at once by an astonishing enthusiasm for classical studies in the University. His greatness as a teacher is seen not only in his success with his marvellous pupil, Edward VI, but in the devotion of a number of brilliant scholars, such as Ascham, Thomas Wilson, and Walter Haddon, who all came out of his school and reflected the ideas of their master. Some of the most striking pages in the *Scholemaster* are those in which Ascham reports what he had learnt from Cheke.

Cheke's character was so noble, he was so undaunted a proclaimer of the best thought of his age, that one pardons the weakness of his recantation. He had been lured back to England, was in dire distress of mind and body, and if he had not recanted would have been burnt alive. But his convictions remained what they were as he declared on his deathbed a few weeks later. Such was the irony of things that in little more than a year the cruel, priest-ridden Queen died, and a Queen came to the throne who would have welcomed Cheke to her counsels. If England had not been robbed of him at the age of forty-three, he might have rendered services to English learning still more remarkable than any for which he is now remembered.

Dr. Nathan's account of Cheke's reformed English spelling (p. 45) is interesting, though he uses the term "diphthong" loosely for a combination of two letters (a digraph), whether or not this implies a combination of two sounds. He says that Cheke wrote "dout," "det," "faut," for "doubt," "debt," "fault"; but this was the common spelling of his time. Some ignorance of English ways is shown when Dr. Nathan, instead of saying that on October 11, 1551, Cheke was knighted, says that he "erhielt das Adels-prädikat das ihn in die obere Gesellschaftsklasse erhob . . . und seinen Kindern Heiraten mit Angehörigen der ersten Familien ermöglichte" (p. 58). On p. 77, through careless reading of a note of Prof. Berdan's, he attributes to Gabriel Harvey a statement very unlike Harvey which was made by Gascoigne. "Marlowe's blankverse in *Hero and Leander*" (p. 86) means presumably "Marlowe's iambic pentameters." There are a certain number of misprints; e.g. p. 8, l. 15 from bottom, read "modis"; p. 10, bottom, read "præstantissimi"; p. 11, l. 16, read "Aristotle . . . whom"; p. 12, l. 1, read "traded"; p. 42, l. 15, read "senariis"; l. 16, read "posteris," l. 19, read "Soteris sesquimillesimo," l. 21, read "protuli"; p. 47, l. 17 from bottom, read "denisoned"; p. 54, l. 7 from bottom, read "funusque"; l. 3 from bottom, "Janua"; p. 55, l. 22, read "illo"; p. 56, l. 3 from bottom, read "(?) "holye." On pp. 30, 31 "Harford" would in modern spelling be "Hertford."

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

**The Tragedie of Coriolanus.** Edited by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS, Jr., Litt.D. (A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare.) London: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1928. Pp. xiii + 762. 30s. net.

THIS is the nineteenth play, and since *Hamlet* fills two, the twentieth volume of an edition which, begun by the father of the present editor in 1871, has become the indispensable tool of all other editors of Shakespeare. There are seventeen plays still to appear, or another nineteen volumes, if the *Sonnets* and the *Poems* are to be included; so that the publication of *Coriolanus* marks the completion of half the series, which should reach its final instalment, assuming the present rate of progress, about 1985. It is true that most of the texts yet to come are those of secondary importance, that is to say, have so far accumulated smaller piles of commentary than more popular plays like *Macbeth* or *Hamlet*. But if *Hamlet* in 1877, when it was first edited by Dr. Furness, Sr., occupied two volumes, how many would it require if it were brought up to date in 1929? And if *Titus Andronicus* be left, say, till 1977, is it not likely to run to as many volumes as *Hamlet* did a century before? In a covering letter sent with the volume before us, the publishers inform us that "five years were required to accomplish this work"; which, they add a little naively, is "probably a much longer time than Shakespeare himself took to write this play." Now, five years is two years longer than the average rate per volume since 1877, and as *Coriolanus* offers no special problems to account for delay, we must suppose that the extension of time is due mainly to the natural accumulation of editorial commentary. It looks, therefore, unless Dr. Furness meanwhile sets up an editorial factory or there occurs a marked decline in the interest taken by scholars in Shakespeare, as if the present rate of progress can hardly be maintained, and that the edition may not reach its conclusion until the early years of the twenty-first century.

If these lines happen to meet the eye of Dr. Furness, he will, I hope, pardon this speculation into the secrets of the prison-house by the inmate of a neighbouring, though much smaller, cell. Speculation is natural, since his mining operations greatly lighten the labours of those who follow in the same road. How comforting, for instance, would it be to hear that his next task was the three



parts of *Henry VI*! To an editor who is keeping to the Folio order and has not yet finished the comedies, *Coriolanus* seems a very long way off; and until he comes close up to it, until indeed he has actually edited it, he is in no position to review Dr. Furness' volume. It is not, of course, necessary to explain to readers of this journal what that volume contains. Suffice it to say that all the usual features are there. Nor need they be assured that the material has been brought together with great care and assiduity. As far as I have been able to test it, the volume fully maintains the standard of its predecessors. Dr. Furness' reading is well up to date. I note names like those of Mr. Crompton Rhodes, Mr. E. E. Kellett, and Mr. Lewis Wyndham in his List of Books, while he quotes Mr. Bayfield at considerable length and—I rejoice to see—has been duly impressed with the arguments of Prof. R. W. Chambers (why does he reverse the initials in his Preface?) in *Shakespeare's Hand in the play of Sir Thomas More*.

On the other hand, I am sorry to note that he lends his authority to the old contempt for the Folio text: "if it be not the most corrupt of the Folio texts, it certainly occupies a high station in that bad eminence" are his words, words which I think he would certainly have expressed differently, had he passed through the experience of preparing texts like *The Merry Wives*, *Measure for Measure*, or *All's Well* for the Press. In comparison with these *Coriolanus* is an excellent text—a little rough perhaps, because of its peculiar spellings and its irregularly divided verse—but, beyond a missing line, the substance of which is easily supplied, containing I believe not a single instance of hopeless corruption. The "List of Emendations adopted in the text of the Cambridge editors," which Dr. Furness prints, runs indeed to thirty items, but almost all of them belong to the order of misprints to be found, often by the handful, in other Shakespearian texts. They include, for instance, Elizabethan spellings like "heard of byles" (herd of boils), "shooting" (shouting), "vnshoot" (unshout), "God" (good), "hope" (holp), "whereon" (where one); elementary misreadings like "scale" (stale), "vnroo'st" (unrooft); simple minim-errors like "contenning" (contemning), "through" (throng), "change" (charge), "teach" (touch); errors mainly of the minim variety but arising partly from archaic or incorrect spelling such as "tongue" for "toge" (? sp. touge), "Lucius" for "Lartius" (? sp. Larcus), "beesome" for "bisson" (? sp. beesone), "Antients" for

"Antiates" (? sp. Anteates), "Calues" for "Cato's" (? sp. Catoes), "Coriolus" for "Corioli" (sp. Corioles), "things" for "thwartings" (? sp. thurtings), "heart" for "herd" (? sp. heard), "actions" for "accents" (? misread as "acciones"), "boyld" for "broiled" (? "bryld" misread as "boyld"); and little slips to which all compositors are prone, such as the omission of "not," and the setting up of "from" instead of "for," "the" instead of "i'th," and (under the influence of neighbouring present participles) of "coming" instead of "come." This leaves unaccounted for two interesting misprints—"haue" for "hate" and "pray" for "prate," which may be due to *e:t* confusion, together with "Ouertur" for "coverture," which looks as though Shakespeare began the word with a capital C, as was his wont, but wrote it like an O<sup>1</sup>; and lastly, a reading at 3.1.396, where the words "in peace," which occur two lines lower down, have been anticipated—a slip, I think, almost certainly made by Shakespeare himself.

The foregoing list, rightly considered, that is to say, considered in the light of the spellings and misprints of other Shakespearian texts, so far from stamping *Coriolanus* as exceptionally corrupt, places it definitely among the "good" texts, viz. those which we have good reason for believing were printed directly from Shakespeare's autograph. As I have written elsewhere on the same play, "both the virtues and the vices of the Folio text are more readily assignable to the hand of Shakespeare than to another's."<sup>2</sup> But, it may be objected, the list only contains corruptions which have been removed, it says nothing of cruces which still baffle us, such, for instance, as the five passages marked with an obelisk in the *Globe Shakespeare*. Let us look at them:—

3.1.154. To iumpe a Body with a dangerous Physicke

3.2.29. I haue a heart as little apt as yours

3.3.26-7. to haue his worth

Of contradiction

4.7.52. Hath not a Tombe so euident as a Chaire

5.2.17. For I haue euer verified my Friends

If "apt" be taken to mean "docile" or "pliable," as I think it may, there is nothing wrong with 3.2.29. As for 5.2.17 the *Oxford Dictionary* actually quotes the passage under "verify." The other

<sup>1</sup> E.g. by omitting or too faintly penning the horizontal stroke.

<sup>2</sup> Introduction to *Folio Facsimile of Coriolanus* (Faber and Gwyer).

three readings, frankly, I suspect ; but I cannot think they are likely to prove stubborn, noting as I do that two of the crucial words (" iumpe " and " worth ") contain minim-letters, in the formation of which Shakespeare's pen so often led sixteenth- and seventeenth-century compositors astray. Anyhow, we have reduced the corruptions in this notoriously corrupt text to three misreadings which should need only a little patience to unravel. There are few even among the Good Quartos which can show so clean a bill of health as this. Is it not about time that real corruption were distinguished from the textual roughness which seventeenth-century compositors seemed unable to avoid when faced by the archaic spellings and somewhat tricky " secretary " hand of William Shakespeare ?

J. DOVER WILSON.

**Sir Thomas Browne's Christian Morals.** The Second Edition with the Life of the Author by SAMUEL JOHNSON, LL.D. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by S. C. ROBERTS. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xix+219. 6s. net.

THIS is a reprint of the second edition (1756) of *Christian Morals*. Mr. Roberts adds an introduction, supplements Johnson's explanatory notes, and records the variant readings (about a dozen in all) from the first edition of 1716. It cannot be said that either on the critical or textual side he has made the most of his opportunities. The introduction is brief and slight, and while the editor has seen the interest of the link between Browne and Johnson, he has not made it the basis for any new or suggestive criticism of either author. In the notes, which are competent and useful as far as they go, we notice two series of omission. On the face of it, a literal reprint with notes would lead us to expect to find recorded the variant readings in MS. Rawl. 109 and MSS. Sloane 1847-8, 1874, 1885 ; and, on another plane, we should expect reference to the parallel passages in " A Letter to a Friend " and " Hydriotaphia." The editor simply refers us to the editions of Wilkin (1836) and Greenhill (1881). His own edition has a value of its own, in that it incorporates Johnson's *Life* and notes and gives us the text of 1756 ; that value would have been enhanced had he made more use of the critical apparatus of his predecessors.

In two instances, cited by Greenhill, reference to the parallel passages in "A Letter to a Friend" clarifies the text. Mr. Roberts passes over them in silence.

- P. 72, l. 9 "when prudent simplicity hath fixt there" (1756).  
 "where prudent simplicity hath fixt thee" (L. to F.).  
 P. 137, l. 16 "With what shift and pains we come into this world" (1756).  
 "With what strift and pains . . ." (L. to F.)

K. M. CONSTABLE.

**The Poems of Nathaniel Wanley.** Edited by L. C. MARTIN.  
 Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1928. Pp. xx+88. 7s. 6d.

THIS collection has an interesting history. Mr. Martin, having edited Vaughan's poems, noticed an affinity to Vaughan in some lines published by Mr. Massingham in an anthology in 1919. He then found that the poem, with some thirty other poems evidently from the same hand, was contained in two Harleian MSS. The authorship of these poems had been ascribed to Thomas Pestell, and remained still uncertain till Mr. Robin Flower of the British Museum was able to produce a third manuscript of the poems which made it clear that they were written by Nathaniel Wanley, father of Humphrey Wanley and Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coventry, already known for his entertaining folio, *The Wonders of the Little World*. Henceforth, thanks to Mr. Martin, Wanley will be more intimately known to us as the author of thirty-nine lyrical poems, chiefly of a religious character, two elegies and two rather remarkable narrative poems, one on the Witch of Endor, the other on Lazarus and Dives.

Of high poetical quality, such as is revealed in Vaughan, there is little or nothing in Wanley: he has not the grace or accomplishment of Cowley, though in an essay of 1925 Mr. Martin said rather rashly that for more of Wanley's narrative exercises, "it would surely be no bad bargain to give a *Gondibert* or *Davideis* in exchange." But these little epics still show powers of ingenious invention, which make them better reading than the rather clumsy lyrics, though these too have their merits.

Mr. Martin somewhat adds to the reader's difficulties by printing the pieces with that absence of punctuation which is found in the MSS., but which would never have been retained if the poems had been printed in Wanley's own time. He is also somewhat sparing

of explanatory notes. "A smooth Phormio's tinkling eloquence" needs a note. The reader is left to wonder at the statement that some lovers of luxury may "On tongues of phenicopters feed." Surely he might have been told that a phenicopter is a flamingo, and that according to Pliny: "phœnicopteri linguam præcipui saporis esse Apicius docuit." Such references would have given a little idea of Wanley's classical reading.

If Mr. Martin had consulted Venn's *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, he would have escaped some small biographical errors. Wanley took his degree in 1653/4, not 1653; Bryan did not "resign" his church at Coventry in 1662, but was ejected. The meaning of a line in the Elegy on Angell would have been made plainer if it had been noted that Angell lost the lectureship of Leicester in 1650 because he refused to take the Engagement "to be true and faithful to the Commonwealth of England as the same is now established without a King or House of Lords" imposed by Parliament in October 1649.

It is not remarked that on p. 60 the line "They march and with a rush that makes" is defective (I suppose, in both manuscripts).

When Saul says that if the Witch frown, she compels the "black Prince" "to twist A rope of sand, or make a Fad I wist," one is not much enlightened by being told that "Fad" is "a sheaf or bundle." Did not Saul say, "make a Had I wist," an ejaculation of remorse? We are not told what Wanley means when he says that the witch "works her temples with the fat of man."

It is not surprising that Wanley was well up in the topography of Leicester. He was born there, and was at school there, and when he left Cambridge for the living of Beeby, he was only five miles away.

We must not dwell on small points. Mr. Martin is in the rare position of having added an interesting personality to the hierarchy of seventeenth-century poetry; and he has edited the new-found poems with that care and skill which we should expect from his character as a scholar. What he has given makes us ask for more, and I should have been glad if he had included in this dainty volume all Wanley's surviving letters, his Latin version of the "Resurrection" poem, gruesome as that poem is, and the controversial verse-letters to Wild. We should then have had a still more complete presentation of the poet and divine.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

**The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage.** By LESLIE HOTSON. Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xi + 424. 23s. net.

DR. HOTSON in a prefatory note encourages us to expect further revelations of the stage and drama of the Commonwealth and Restoration periods, though he has already provided new material sufficient to place us under a considerable debt of gratitude. The reader will share his regret that the compass of his present book should have compelled him to omit "some of the amenities of Restoration stage gossip." Dr. Hotson's researches in the Public Record Office have brought to light important facts concerning the history of the stage; it is now certain that the players suffered as much from professional jealousies amongst themselves as from the interference of the red-coats; the discovery of Swanston's will is a matter of some interest; the charge against General Harrison of having slain Robinson the player is finally disposed of; the money value of a share in the Blackfriars company is now found to have been 50*l.*; the clouded question of the membership of the Queen's and King's companies is clearly resolved; for the first time full details are given of surreptitious performances of plays during the Interregnum, and of the periodic raids by the soldiers which terminated so many of them; further evidence is adduced of the methods of securing the cohesion of a company by mutual bond and an agreement not to sue unless the company were broken; private bear-baiting is shown to have taken place at St. John's Street, Clerkenwell, and also at the Hope on the Bank-side; the question of the size of a share in the Red Bull profits, and that of the "gatherer's place" (that it was an eighteenth, not a seventh part) is settled; sufficient information regarding the origin of the Phoenix or Cockpit in Drury Lane, and the Beeston family that controlled it, has been wrung from the legal records of the time to provide Dr. Hotson with material for a lively story. We learn that it was originally built in 1609, that from a cockpit it became a private playhouse, and that William Beeston attempted to wrest control of it from his mother and step-mother by a private arrangement with the landlord. Of equal interest is the story of the Salisbury Court Theatre, Gibbons' Tennis Court (two new views of which have been discovered by Dr. Hotson), and Lisle's Tennis Court,



which witnessed and itself provided many a lively scene before Sir William Davenant took a lease of it in 1660. During the Commonwealth, Sir Balthazar Gerbier's Academy (known through the researches of Prof. Foster Watson) afforded instruction in the arts which languished on account of the suppression of the stage, for the histrionic talents of young gentlemen were encouraged under a cloak of education. We learn, too, that Davenant had been giving entertainments before the *First Days Entertainment at Rutland House* (May 1656), which has always been regarded as the first authorised production of opera under the Puritan Government. Further details of Davenant's career are revealed by Dr. Hotson's shrewd and fascinating gloss on a ballad, *How Daphne pays his debts* (first observed by Prof. Hyder Rollins). Cromwell comes out of the affair with credit. Under him Davenant seems to have been well treated as a sort of unofficial Master of the Revels, and to have been befriended also by Whitelocke and Maynard.

It is impossible, of course, to notice here all the new material that the book presents, but mention must be made of the valuable and amusing sketch of the life of George Jolly the strolling player, and of the equally valuable, though less amusing, sketch of the history of the various theatrical companies in Restoration times—the Duke's, the King's, and, later, the United Companies. Here Dr. Hotson has filled in the outline already drawn by Mr. Lawrence and Prof. Allardyce Nicoll, to both of whom he generously admits his indebtedness on many points.

His discoveries (or it may be simply the compass of the book) have, however, led him to pay less than adequate attention to the more obvious sources of information concerning Commonwealth drama. For instance, the prefaces to books of plays published during the Interregnum would have yielded valuable information to a student of Dr. Hotson's rare and profound scholarship. There is, for example, Humphrey Moseley's 1651 edition of William Cartwright's plays, with an interesting prefatory poem by John Berkenhead on the ribaldry of plays—this, coming from Berkenhead, is a remarkable piece of evidence: Bedell's 1653 edition of Robert Mead's plays in a preface to which the stationer pleads for the re-opening of the theatres; Aston Cockaine's præludium to Richard Brome's plays (1653), containing a similar plea and a reference to "the rustic prose of a Jack-pudding," with which plain fare the lover of the drama had then to remain content. It also contains an

unsigned poem alluding to the relaxation of restrictions on dramatic poets brought about by the change in government. There is, further, John Cotgrave's *English Treasury of Wit* (1655) collected from plays to demonstrate to the godly party how moral and improving dramatic writing could be—an anthology with an obvious aim! Again, the part played by Adrian Vlack in printing English plays at the Hague, copies of which were smuggled into this country, was surely worth recording. Equally worthy of notice was the production (stated on the authority of Langbaine) of Lodowick Carlell's plays at the private house in Blackfriars "notwithstanding the prohibition of plays in those days," and of Alex. Brome's *The Cunning Lovers*, acted (according to E. Sanford) at the private house in Drury in 1651.

It is surprising that Dr. Hotson should have overlooked the postscript to the 1654 edition of R. Flecknoe's *Love's Dominion* (written as a pattern for the reformed stage and prudently dedicated to Cromwell's favourite daughter), wherein the author made over the acting rights to "Mr. Will Beeston, who by Reason of his long Practice and Experience in this way as also for having brought up most of the Actors extant, I think the fittest Man for this Charge and Imployment."

More surprising is Dr. Hotson's neglect of Thomas Jordan, concerning whose part in Commonwealth drama there remains something to be said. It is known that the restoration of city pageantry took place in 1655 upon the mayoralty of Sir John Dethick. Edmund Gayton, first of the city poets of the period, composed *Charity Triumphant* in celebration of the Lord Mayor's Show on October 29, 1655. In 1657 Thomas Jordan, the city poet, seems to have publicly presented a masque, *Fancy's Festivals*, which was later printed by Thomas Wilson and dedicated to Francis Lenthall, jun. by the author. That it should have been allowed by the authorities is a sign (unrecorded by Dr. Hotson) of a general loosening of Puritan restrictions; for some of the songs which it contained gently upbraided the Government for its long suppression of the muses, and the moralitas is hard to find. Perhaps it is not strictly accurate to regard Davenant as the first since the closing of the theatres to produce publicly a dramatic entertainment that had the official sanction of the authorities, for it may be that a dramatic performance of a sort accompanied the revival of the city pageantry in October 1655. However that may be, there is no doubt that this

revived pomp and pageantry paved the way for Davenant, and we could wish that Dr. Hotson had found place to include it in his discussion of the subject.

Apart from Professor Hyder Rollins's paper (*Studies in Philology*, 1921) this is the first important contribution to our knowledge of Commonwealth drama, and it is therefore a pity that Dr. Hotson did not allow himself more than a hundred pages in which to deal with it, and that he should have found it necessary to exclude consideration of the activities of players in the provinces—there was, for example, a raid on certain royalist players at Newcastle in 1656 to which Professor Rollins has drawn attention in his paper.

It would be ungenerous, however, to dwell on the omissions, which are few, and inevitable in a work of such a scope as this, and not to express our appreciation of a brilliant book.

It is to be hoped that the second edition will be equipped with a more complete index.

W. M. CLYDE.

**The Letterbook of Sir George Etherege.** Edited by SYBIL ROSENFELD, M.A. (*Lond.*). Oxford University Press, London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. ix+441. 18s. net.

A COMPLETE edition of the Letter Book has long been desired, and although much of Etherege's official correspondence is necessarily concerned with diplomatic trivialities at Ratisbon or the latest news of the Empire, such an edition has the value of tacitly correcting the malice of Hugh Hughes. The secretary's spiteful account of his master's diversions loses much of its sting when appended to this great mass of dispatches, which gives evidence enough that the envoy's official work was not neglected. Miss Rosenfeld prints the manuscript as it stands from beginning to end, but has "modernized the spelling and expanded the abbreviations"; she has also tacitly modernised the punctuation (which was indeed insufficient), sometimes however to the damage of the run of the sentence, and occasionally to the detriment of the sense. In view of these departures, shoulder references to the folios of the MS. should have been supplied throughout her text. A list of the illustrations might also have been added—there is, for instance, nothing to show where the frontispiece is taken from—and the publishers might perhaps

have issued so bulky and expensive a volume in serviceable cloth rather than in a quarter binding of fancy boards. Miss Rosenfeld gives, as a "Specimen of Etherege's handwriting," an excellent facsimile of the last twenty lines of his first known letter (Constantinople, 1670), now in the Record Office. Unfortunately, however, only the signature of this letter is in Etherege's hand, the rest being in that of a clerk. It might therefore have been better to illustrate one of the three letters from Ratisbon (from S. P. Foreign, German States, 1683-1692), which are all holograph.

Miss Rosenfeld is to be congratulated on having found in the State Papers of 1689 a "Pass for Hugh Hughes" which identifies Etherege's secretary ("Mr. H. H.") beyond all doubt, and she has clearly taken considerable pains to collect, from the historical works of reference which she specifies, notes on the chief people mentioned in the letters. She has, however, diminished the value of her Index by undue exclusiveness; historical personages, or literary celebrities, may usually be found there, but the minor figures of Restoration life and literature, to whom Etherege's references are often interesting—such persons as Captain Pack, Will Richards, Betty Mackerel, Mrs. Davies—are excluded from it.

Miss Rosenfeld's account of Etherege's life does not disclose new facts, but in it she speaks twice, with some asperity, of Oldys' article in *Biographia Britannica* as "unreliable." It is true that a number of Oldys' statements have not stood the light of later knowledge, but respectful language is always due to that great antiquary and biographer, "of whom [if the writer may misapply a famous sentence] truly I know not, whether to mervaille more, either that he, in that mistie time, could see so clearely, or that wee, in this cleare age, walk so stumblingly after him." Accuracy, however, is certainly a prime virtue, and in an editor it may almost be called a necessity. To check the whole 384 pages of Miss Rosenfeld's text by the original MS. would be too heavy a task for a reviewer, but some conclusions upon this head may be reached by the examination here and there of a single letter or famous passage.

A number of textual errors are doubtless due to faulty proof-reading; such are "Perwick" (for "Perwich," p. 9, n. 3), "1673" (for "1693," p. 9, n. 5), "head the stage" (for "tread the stage," p. 227, n. 3), "James" (for "Jones," p. 368, n. 1), "conjure" (MS. "conjuge," p. 373, l. 14), "hucus" (MS. "huius," p. 396, l. 37), "expertum" (MS. "expertem," p. 397, l. 16), "curati"

(MS. "aurati," p. 397, l. 17), "serario" (MS. "ærario," p. 399, l. 34), "effectat," "arte" and "mercantur" (MS. "affectat," "certe," and "mereantur," p. 400, ll. 13, 15, and 20), and "say" (MS. "lay," p. 410, l. 40). Others might be harder to detect; e.g. "in" (MS. "on," p. 80, l. 21), "tumble" ("tremble," 81. 7), "She" ("For she," 81. 12), "There" ("Here," 117. 12), "case" ("ease," 140. 19), "fateful" ("fatall," 176. 7), "fitness" ("fatness," 212. 12), "the" ("this," 239. 26), "way" ("was," 274. 13), "so" ("as," 293. 36), "band" ("Baud," 344. 8), "poet" ("Peer," 348. 18), "here you" ("you here," 348. 22), "Forget" ("For yet," 348. 24), "sollicita" ("sollicitæ," 364. 27), "would" ("cou'd," 375. 31), "good" ("great," 384. 23), "pire" ("pite," 386. 35), "est, set" ("esset," 397. 24), "videndi" ("vivendi," 400. 6); also the omission of the MS. lacuna dots after *verba* (103. 16), of "true" before "description" (109. 16), of "with him at last," after "dis-temper" (384. 6), and of "not" after "doubt" (410. 19).

Miss Rosenfeld has at times made tacit corrections of errors in the MS., such as "than" (MS. "that," 219. 17), "loved a fiddler" (MS. "lov'd fidler," 344. 12), "load" (MS. "Law," 376. 1); but at other times she has, without comment, allowed obvious mistakes to stand; e.g. "fights" (MS. error for "sights"), 81. 10; "them" (for "then"), 344. 1; "me" (for "meo"), 397. 10; "sumptos" (for "sumptus"), 398. 22; "viginta" (for "viginti"), 398. 26. At times—whether from lack of acquaintance with seventeenth-century idiom, or from a desire to modernise it—she falsifies her text; Etherege wrote: "I have a great esteem for the Count de Lamberg, he is a gentleman (besides his other merits) knows how to live." This is printed: "I have a great esteem for the Count de Lamberg; he is a gentleman; besides his other merits he knows how to live." Similarly, she alters "in Town" to "in the town" (380. 5), "out of Town" to "out of the town" (387. 5), "not finding in your heart" to "not finding it in your heart" (169. 1), "Rhenish" to "Rhenish wine" (228. 7), "be at Daggers-drawing" to "be daggers-drawing" (382. 1), and "being lett to follow his own Course" to "being left to follow his own course" (396. 5). Her treatment of the punctuation leads her into various troubles; when she prints: "Some time or other I have good horses and often go a hunting" (304. 15), the first four words belong to the previous sentence; she makes nonsense of Hughes' couplet about Etherege,



For he by force of magic might  
At pleasure turn the day to night

by printing commas after "he" and "might" (342. 5); and her mispunctuation of some lines of the text of Hughes' Latin letter to the Chamberlains and Senators of Ratisbon causes her to mistranslate them (398. 30; 403. 23-4). Another mistranslation occurs later in the same letter, where "Sed de his penitus inquirendi alia mihi vice occasionem expecto, quod quidem pensum in me libenter accipiam" is rendered by "But concerning this I expect an opportunity of inquiring more closely another time, what indeed is paid to me I will gladly accept" (400. 8; 404. 34). In the same letter Hughes spoke of money sent to Etherege "per literas Cambij Dño Martino datas"; Miss Rosenfeld prints "datas" as "Dalas," and evolves an imaginary "Mr. Martin Dalas" in her translation (399. 36; 404. 25). Another ghost is "the fair Castle" of an earlier letter (240. 3); there is no such person; the MS. reads "the fair Cuffle," whose name should not be unfamiliar to students of Etherege.

Miss Rosenfeld might have been saved from some absurdities by closer study of the literature of her subject. In the same letter is a sentence in which Etherege allusively confesses his ignorance of the authorship of *The Hind and the Panther Transvers'd*, which evidently reminds him of *The Rehearsal*: "I cannot guesse on whom the Duke of Bucks' mantle is fallen, but it is

With doubl'd portion of that Prophets art."

In transcribing this in the Letter Book, Hughes added a marginal reference "Mac. Fl." to the left of the quotation. Miss Rosenfeld (failing, it seems, to recognise the last line of Dryden's satire, and failing also to perceive that Etherege was referring to the unknown Prior and Montague) accordingly prints: "I cannot guess on whom the Duke of Bucks' mantle is fallen, but it is MacFlecknoe with doubled portion of that prophet's art," and appends a footnote, "MS. 'Mac Fl': presumably an allusion to Dryden's satire as a worthy successor to Buckingham's *Rehearsal*." The mistakes were needless, for the passage had already been correctly printed, and the allusion explained, in Etherege's *Works*, 1927, I. lvij. Similarly, Miss Rosenfeld gives to Middleton's letter of December 7, 1685 (which alludes, by the way, to the "witt," not the "will," of Etherege's successors) the incomprehensible ending "and, as for



advice, zagos is the best that can be given you" (345. 18). She would have found the reference to Iago elucidated on p. xlij of the same volume of the *Works*. Her idea that "Rochester was answered by *The Man of Mode*" (10. 22) had also been previously corrected (*Works*, I, xxij), and it is unfortunate that she should repeat (14. 30-3), as a reference to Etherege, the verses quoted by Miss D. Foster in the *Times Literary Supplement* of February 16, 1922, when a glance at the *Works*, Vol. I, p. xxx, or at *R.E.S.*, Vol. III, p. 237, would have shown her that these lines could only refer to the second marriage of Judge Jeffreys. Incidentally, why does Miss Rosenfeld state (p. 14, notes 2 and 3) that both *A Westminster Wedding* and *The Present State of Matrimony* are to be found in Harleian MS. 162? It would be an odd place for them, even chronologically, for MS. Harl. 162 is the first volume of Sir Simonds d'Ewes' *Journal of the House of Commons*, November 1640 to February 1641, and includes no such frivolities. Both poems may indeed be found in a Harleian MS., but its number is 7319.

A few other points may be mentioned. "Prince of the Council" (56, note 1) is a queer title for Laurence Hyde; it must be meant for "Lord President." Miss Rosenfeld repeats (212, note 1) the old legend that the roof of the theatre fell in at the first performance of Sedley's *Bellamira*; the correct explanation was given by Haslewood over a century ago, and made prominent recently by Professor Pinto in his life of Sedley (1927, p. 147). She states (365, note 1), of the poem "Upon the Downs when shall I breath at ease?", that "This is far better than other occasional poems by Etherege. Probably it is by the 'Coll. Ashton' whose name is so enigmatically appended to it." There is nothing enigmatical about the appearance of the Colonel's name at the foot of a poem which he pretty certainly wrote; it is attributed to him in another MS. of the period, as well as by Hughes, who merely copied it down in that section of the Letter Book, devoted to "Letters Recd.," in which he also copied verses by Dryden. It is not the only good poem ascribed to Ashton by contemporary witness. Miss Rosenfeld says (62, note 1) that the first verse letter to Lord Middleton seems "first to have been printed in 'The History of Adolphus, Prince of Prussia and the Princess Fidelity,'" but she does not give the date, though from note 1 on p. 80 she appears to think it was 1696—five years too late. Evidently she has not examined the book, whose title she takes from the *Term Catalogues* (making, however, errors of "Prussia" for the *T.C.'s*

"Russia" and "Fidelity" for the *T.C.'s* "Felicity"—the book itself calls the lady "the Princess of Happiness"). Her textual apparatus for the letters to Middleton, and for Dryden's answer, is far from satisfactory, and her quotation from MS. Birch 4221 contains several verbal errors and one tacit misrepresentation; the Bowdlerised statement that Etherege threatened to "kiss" Mrs. Locket was made indeed by Thornbury, from whom it may be supposed Miss Rosenfeld adopts it, but her book is hardly intended for the same public as *Haunted London*, and an editor, who was prepared to print in full what Hughes has to say about Etherege, should not have distorted Birch's discreet "——".

This edition, then, can hardly be called accurate, but it provides a text of a great number of previously unprinted letters, which will enable Etherege's life at Ratisbon to appear in truer perspective than has hitherto been attainable by students without access to the Manuscript Room of the British Museum.

H. F. B. BRETT-SMITH.

**An Appreciation of Colley Cibber, Actor and Dramatist,**  
together with a Reprint of his Play *The Careless Husband*.  
By D. M. E. HABBEMA, Litt.D. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris.  
1928. Pp. iii+190. 6s. 6d.

OF this handsomely printed and illustrated volume fifty-two pages are devoted to an Appreciation of Colley Cibber as Actor, Theatrical Manager and Dramatist, fourteen to an Introduction to *The Careless Husband*, one hundred to a text of that comedy and twenty to appendices and bibliography. Dr. Habbema has certainly made a careful study of Cibber's works, and of a number of modern critical writings on the drama and theatre of Restoration and eighteenth-century England, but it is difficult to see exactly what purpose his book can be said to serve. If it had been written in Dutch, it would, no doubt, have been an excellent introduction to the subject for Dutch students. As it is written in English, it is presumably meant for the English-speaking public, and it is not unjust to Dr. Habbema to say that there is little in his "Appreciation" which English and American students cannot find for themselves in very easily accessible works. Thus we have the usual quotations from Pepys and the

Memoirs of de Grammont to illustrate the dissolute life of the Restoration Court, and from the *Tatler*, *Spectator*, and Cibber's own *Apology* to give a picture of theatrical conditions at the beginning of the eighteenth century, while the works of Prof. Allardyce Nicoll are drawn upon freely. For some reason best known to Dr. Habbema, Appendix I is devoted to an annotated reprint of the famous *Order of the lords and Commons concerning Stage-plays* of 1642. It is true that the plays of Cibber grew out of the comedies of the reign of Charles II, and that the spirit of those comedies was affected by the reaction against Puritanism; but the old Puritan decree is surely about as relevant to the comedies of Cibber as a document relating to the interludes of the age of Henry VIII would be to the comedies of Shakespeare. Lack of originality in such a well-worn field might be excused if the matter was presented in an attractive style, or if we were treated to some really illuminating criticism. Unfortunately, it is impossible to commend either Dr. Habbema's style or his critical acumen as displayed in this work. A foreign critic cannot perhaps be expected to write the best English, but he should at least acquire sufficient mastery over the language to avoid such sentences as the following:

From this moment the managers enjoyed a period of almost uninterrupted prosperity, till 1733, when Cibber retired and set himself to writing his *Apology*, although he made several reappearances on the stage (p. 4).

... we print the *Hymn to the Laureat* by Mrs. Mary Chapman, the evident sincerity of which makes it worth being reproduced (p. 61).

The text of *The Careless Husband* reproduces faithfully the quarto copy of the editio princeps in the Bodleian Library, also so far as capitalisation, punctuation, and abbreviations are concerned (Note on the Text of *The Careless Husband*).

The quality of Dr. Habbema's criticism may not unfairly be represented by the following judgment on the morality of *The Careless Husband*:

To conclude, we can say that in *The Careless Husband* Cibber produced a genuinely moral play, in which vice was punished and virtue rewarded, and in which, moreover, oaths and obscene language were avoided as far as was consistent with the characters of the people represented in it.

Apparently if an author botches up a "moral" ending to a comedy, and avoids coarse language, his work is to be called "genuinely

moral." To the present writer the frank ribaldry and obscenity of the Restoration dramatists seem infinitely less immoral than the sickly prurience of the "sentimental" comedies as exemplified by the scenes that deal with the intrigue between *Sir Charles Easy*, and *Edging* the maidservant in *The Careless Husband*. Such a judgment as Dr. Habbema's, moreover, comes with a particularly bad grace from one who accuses Elwin and Courthope of attempting to "whitewash the character" of Pope by "specious argumentation and incoherent accumulation of unconvincing and contradictory statements."

In his note on his Text of *The Careless Husband* (a specimen of which has been quoted), Dr. Habbema professes to give an exact reprint of the Bodleian copy of the First Quarto of 1705, except for the correction of what he calls "evident errors of punctuation due to carelessness." Apparently Dr. Habbema is not aware of the fact that there was an old English system of punctuation almost universally followed in the drama, which, unlike modern English punctuation, was based on rhetorical and not grammatical considerations. Nearly all "the errors" which he "corrects" in his text are merely examples of the old rhetorical punctuation fully explained in Mr. Percy Simpson's *Shakespearian Punctuation* (Clarendon Press), a book which we commend to Dr. Habbema's notice.

Thus the light punctuation of such a sentence as the following gives an effect which is completely spoilt when the editor substitutes a semicolon for the comma of the original after "Qualities."

I can't boast of my good Qualities, nor if I could, do I believe you think 'em useless (i. i. 192, 193).

Even in such a sentence as the following, it would have been much better to have retained Cibber's own punctuation, instead of trying to modernise it by changing the first comma into a full stop:

I had no relief but that, had I not thee now and then to talk an Hour, my Life were insupportable (i. i. 321, 322).

If Dr. Habbema had been printing a modernised text, such changes would of course have been perfectly justified; but if old spelling, and what Dr. Habbema calls "capitalisation" are to be retained, why should not old punctuation be retained also?

In spite of his declaration in his Preface, Dr. Habbema's text diverges from the First Quarto in other respects besides that of

punctuation.<sup>1</sup> The common old spelling "hast" is quite unnecessarily changed to "haste" in III. i. 257. Misprints are quite rightly corrected in III. i. 173 and IV i. 381; but bad ones are left uncorrected in II. i. 377 ("Trying in on" for "Trying it on"),<sup>2</sup> III. i. 274 ("Dit" for "Did"), and III. i. 275 ("Fait" for "Faith").<sup>3</sup>

On the whole the Dutch printer had done his work fairly well, although a quotation on p. 21 (footnote) is horribly mangled. The best things in the book are undoubtedly the beautiful photographs of the bust of Cibber in the National Portrait Gallery, the delightful painting of him by Grisoni in the character of *Lord Foppington*, and Jonathan Richardson's charming picture of Anne Oldfield.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

**The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham.** Edited with Notes and Introduction by THEODORE HOWARD BANKS, Jr. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. xii+362. 23s.

LITERARY students, if asked what Sir John Denham wrote, would at once remember *Cooper's Hill*, possibly also *The Sophy*, but most would be hard put to it to mention anything else. Yet Denham was the author of a number of poetical translations, executed with a conscious art which makes them of importance in the history of seventeenth-century verse, and of a number of occasional and topical poems which, if sometimes coarse, are always witty. His early elegy on Judge Crook and his late elegy on Cowley alike give evidence of high qualities of head and heart. Dr. Banks has therefore earned our gratitude by presenting us with a critical edition of all Denham's poetical productions and prefacing it with a careful account of the poet's chequered life and of the history of his chief works. He proves that the story of Denham's taking a damp sheet of *Paradise Lost* into the House of Commons may after all have some basis of truth. By careful collations he shows how

<sup>1</sup> By the Editor's own admission in his textual notes. I have only been able to consult the Second Quarto of 1705 for the purpose of this review.

<sup>2</sup> Q. 2 has the correct reading, "Trying it on", but this is not recorded in Dr. Habbema's note.

<sup>3</sup> The last two errors may be due to the Dutch printer. Q. 2 has "Did" and "Faith."

*Cooper's Hill* (he does not remark how near the scene of the poem was to the poet's home at Egham) grew to its final form by repeated revisions. He demonstrates how largely the poem was imitated and how many attempts were made by critics to answer Dryden's challenge and explain the secrets of the pleasure afforded by its most famous quatrain. Dr. Banks has done a good deal to illustrate his text and clear away difficulties. It is here, however, that his work is least satisfying. His notes are generally short and leave us asking for more. In some cases he has neglected to use obvious sources of information. On p. 102 he shows ignorance of Robert Wisdom's translation of the Psalms—"it would appear that Wisdom was some obscure religious scribbler." He would have learnt what he wanted by turning to the *D.N.B.* Of the phrase "*Legem pone*" meaning "Pay up," he says, p. 136, "I have been unable to locate this reference." But the phrase with its curious history is in the *O.E.D.* He illustrates, p. 119, "the best things corrupted are the worst" by two lines of Shakespeare's *Sonnet* 94. The words, however, merely render the common proverb "*corruptio optimi pessima*." William Murray was created Lord Dysart in 1643, not 1651 (p. 111), and lived at least till June 1654 (see my *Letters of Dorothy Osborne*, p. 285). *The Sophy* has many more Shakespearian echoes than are given in Dr. Banks's notes. Some unacquaintance with Latin is shown by the fact that Anthony a Wood's work is always given as *Athenæ Oxoniensis*, and by the mis-spellings "*soras*" (=foras), p. 180, and "*Superscætatiuous*" (=Superfætatiuous), p. 313.

p. 100. "To Sir John Mennis." It is not explained why Mennis's female companion is "*Bulgarian*." Had the term some slang sense?

Whom I think they call old Loven.

If this refers to Mennis, he may have got the nickname by living at Louvain during the exile. I cannot accept Dr. Banks's suggestion that "*Loven*" means "*loving*."

Hadst thou not thy fill of carting,  
Will. Aubrey Count of Oxon?

To which there is a note in the 1668 edition: "We three riding in a cart from Dunkirk to Calice. . ."

The three who had done this were apparently Mennis, Denham and Aubrey de Vere, 20th Earl of Oxford (1626-1703) (see *D.N.B.*), and I can only imagine that the second line should run:

With Aubrey, Count of Oxon?



Dr. Banks's note runs : " Perhaps this is William Aubrey, younger brother of John Aubrey. . . . The title here given to him is, of course, jocular." But the sense seems to require that the stanza should be addressed to Mennis.

Wisdom's Psalms were sung by criminals at Tyburn before their execution.

The old driver of Swine  
That day sure was thine.

*i.e.* you were driven by the same devil who drove the swine into the sea.

p. 112. It is strange if Denham speaks of himself in 1652 as " the Sheriffe " (" the shreefe " is the better reading) on the ground that he had been Sheriff of Surrey ten years before. It is not clear to me that Denham is here in question.

p. 121. Ut metit Autumnus fruges quas parturit Æstas,  
Sic Ortum Natura, dedit Deus his quoq; Finem.

Dr. Banks says : " I have been unable to trace this quotation." The couplet as it stands cannot be classical, though the concluding words are adapted from Verg. *Æn.* i, 199 : " O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem."

I think " Sic Ortum Natura " should be " Sic Orsum Natura " (cf. Verg. *Culex*, l. 2, " tenuem formavimus orsum "), and the lines are an apology for the poem's being left unfinished. " As Autumn mows down the crops to which Summer gave birth, so Nature cuts short my undertaking, for these things also, God has appointed an end."

p. 123. You see the Kings embraces.  
Those Counsels he approv'd before:

Should not we read, " the King embraces Those," etc. ?

p. 124. Did I for this my County bring  
To help their Knight against their King  
And raise the first Sedition ?

Dr. Banks says : " Their knight is Sir John Hotham, whose refusal to surrender . . . Hull to the King . . . precipitated the Civil War."

But it is Hampden who is speaking, and his county must be Buckinghamshire, of which he had been Knight of the Shire. Is not " the first Sedition " the refusal to pay Ship money ?

I cannot explain the rest of the stanza.

p. 139. note 17. "Hughley Park" should be "Hagley Park."

p. 140. Denham writes of Tom Pantton :

Still lower he goes and all men suppose  
Bee (MS. Hee, Query, Hee bee) swallow'd up in the quicke sands.

There is an obscure allusion here which is explained by a letter of Dorothy Osborne's of May 25, 1654, in which she says that Lady M. Sandis (wife of Lord Sandys de Vyne) went to a race meeting at Winchester with Colonel Paunton and refused her husband's invitation to his house near by, though she would have accepted it "if Tom Paunton and J. Morton and the rest would have gone."

p. 147. If the *Panegyrick on Monck* appeared as a broadside with the date 1659, one must suppose by its contents that 1659 meant February or March 1659/60.

p. 157, l. 4. "In this own" Query, "In his own"?

Denham owed much of his fame in his own day to his having been, as it was held, an innovator in verse-writing. May we also give him credit for having been an innovator in prose? His preface to *The Destruction of Troy*, a translation of the Second *Aeneid* published in 1656, is a beautiful piece of natural English which comes little short of Dryden's wonderful *Essay* of 1668.

It is interesting to learn that an earlier translation by Denham of *Aeneid* II-VI remains unpublished in private hands. This, Dr. Banks reports, was probably made in 1636 and abounds in run-on couplets and other licences, carefully removed from the two books revised in 1653 and printed respectively in 1656 and 1668. There seems to be a hope that this interesting early version will shortly be given to the world by the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson of Trinity College, Oxford.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

**La Jeunesse de William Beckford et la Genèse de son "Vathek."** Par MARCEL MAY, Docteur de l'Université de Paris. Paris : Les Presses Universitaires de France. 1928. 9 in. Pp. 440, App. Bibliog. 45 fr.

THE bizarre genius of William Beckford, his unrestrained individualism and hatred of humanity in the mass, found outward expression in three ways : his cloistered life, the erection of his

grandiose palace in the solitudes of Fonthill, and his writings, especially *Vathek*. Here M. May has undertaken a study of Beckford's *vie intérieure*, collating the biographical facts with the writings, and showing, with a plethora of illustration, that *Vathek* was at least as personal a reflection of the man as *Childe Harold* and *Don Juan* were of Byron—a parallel which, however, he leaves the reader to draw. Hardly any new biographical material is put forward. M. May pleads that he was not allowed access to the Beckford papers now in the custody of the Duke of Hamilton. The Duke very properly referred him to the *Life and Letters* by Lewis Melville, who explored this source very thoroughly, and, if he did not exhaust it, at any rate provided evidence enough in the two hundred letters quoted to have saved M. May from certain amusing delusions which impair the value of the book. As it is, M. May has relied on an incomplete examination of Melville, on Dr. Garnett's valuable but not quite accurate memoir in the *D.N.B.*, and on the earlier compilation of that arrant book-maker, Cyrus Redding, for his main outlines, and for illustrative detail on some relevant and a good many irrelevant sources, and on his own conjecture.

A notice in the *London Chronicle* for October 2, 1760, has enabled him to show that his hero was born, not at Fonthill, as is usually stated, but at his father's town house in Soho Square. But this documentary correction is more than counterbalanced by various errors and a huge absurdity. In one delusion Lewis Melville must go shares with him, since this authority, without giving chapter and verse, makes Beckford himself claim Count Anthony Hamilton as his ancestor. It is most unlikely that even Beckford, who is reported to have vaunted his descent from all the barons who signed Magna Carta, apparently without inquiring who were married and who single, would have boasted that his mother came of one who notoriously died a bachelor. M. May attaches much importance to this fallacious point, and repeatedly reminds the reader that his author had in his veins the blood of the famous pseudo-oriental raconteur. Still, there is much that is both true and worth demonstrating in M. May's chief proposition, and he contributes a particularly useful item to the history of Beckford's masterpiece in his close comparison of the English (1786) and the two French editions (1787), and in the interesting hypothesis which this has suggested.

In an early chapter, he deals rather summarily with the problem

of heredity. Without entirely agreeing with his conclusions, we may accept the rough generalisation that the future author of *Vathek* drew his insubordinate and headstrong disposition from the Beckfords and his imaginative propensities from the Hamiltons. But M. May himself shows, with almost a superfluity of evidence, that heredity had less to do with the evolution of the great egoist than his solitary and artificial upbringing, the environment that fostered his extravagant dreams, and the enormous fortune, inherited at an early age, which gave him the means to realise these. He might also have made some allowance for the prevailing currents of the time, which threw up so many meditations among the tombs, so many high-flown heroes and heroines, far-fetched histories, and buildings of like fantastic conception. The oriental features of *Vathek* are accidental; it is as much a "Gothic" romance as Strawberry Hill or Fonthill Abbey was a "Gothic" building. In an eclectic fashion, dwelling on those aspects of Beckford's life that support his main thesis, but ignoring much that is essential to a true portrait, M. May, like Lewis Melville before him, now takes up the story of the "romantic boy" at the age of thirteen, soon after the death of his father, the famous Lord Mayor.

Chatham, that father's friend and the boy's godfather, described the young William as "compounded of the elements of air and fire." M. May exhibits him at those moments, presumably between his regular lessons, when he might be found wandering dreamily through the park and woods encircling the "peaceful palace" of Fonthill, espying phantasms under the dark colonnades of the Egyptian hall in the sumptuous residence built by the Lord Mayor, listening entranced to the noise of running water in the twilight, and reading Ariosto or Galland's *Arabian Nights* with an older playmate of the same fanciful bent, his father's step-daughter Elizabeth March. It may be that the funeral pomps of this popular idol left an indelible impression on his mind. But everything conspired to feed his imagination. Hardly out of his adolescence, the boy, preserved uncontaminated by a public school or college education, was sent to Geneva to complete his singular preparation for life, and there continued to dream on his own account, and turned all external influences to the further nourishment of his visions. These influences are carefully registered by M. May. Beckford visited Voltaire at Ferney, and received the patriarch's benediction. Voltaire was no romanticist; but the streak of sardonic humour that

went with Beckford's love of the mysterious and the extravagant—a trait that assimilates him to Hamilton of the *Contes de Féerie*—was a link between them. The youth was on a more intimate and affectionate footing with the Swiss professor, Henri Mallet, whose *Northern Antiquities* were just now exciting as much attention in England as on the Continent. The naturalist Bonnet, his nephew Horace de Saussure, explorer of Mont Blanc, and Huber, the collector and observer of birds of prey, were among the savants of his acquaintance. Beckford was an ardent reader of scientific literature; and the works of these men, together with a set of Buffon and 238 volumes of the *Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, appear in the catalogue of his library. What attracted him, however, was less the study of phenomena than the theories and speculations to which it led on the nature of the cosmos, and on the ultimate problems of the sources of energy and the origin of life. As M. May puts it, he was haunted by a sense of the extreme, the sublime, the absolute. Beckford was a young Faustus aspiring to universal knowledge, for the key to all the mysteries. Whether or not he read Lessing's recent utterances on the Faust legend, or the *Faust* of the poet Müller, published whilst he was in Switzerland, there is no saying; but he must have been familiar with a theme so singularly congenial, which was then in the air. M. May thinks he has found in *Vathek* some reminiscences of Marlowe's play.

In the neighbouring mountains Beckford was able to indulge his romantic melancholy and thirst for solitude to the full. Vast heights and gloomy depths, utter stillness, absolute silence, fascinated him like music. He lolled for hours in a turfy hollow on the summit of the Salève, gazing thrilled into vertiginous chasms and musing on the beyond. When, presently and in later years, he went farther afield, to Italy for instance, it was the same. Lady Hamilton captivated him—the first Lady Hamilton, that is, not the famous Emma, who attracted him years later, though M. May does not make this clear—but if he could not have her company he preferred his own to any one else's, and found the scenery that he liked best in the rugged wilderness of the Phlegræan Fields. The first edition of his curious travel-diary, *Dreams, Waking Thoughts, and Incidents*, had a frontispiece by Cipriani, engraved by Bartolozzi, illustrating the tale of two lovers, who had betrayed, the one a husband, the other his own bosom friend, and threw themselves in expiation into an unfathomable gulf in this region. Here M. May is unlucky

enough to perceive a clue to a mystery that nobody had ever suspected in the life of his hero.

He believes that this story is only a disguised account of Beckford's liaison with Mrs. Peter Beckford, wife of his cousin, and argues that it was through the unpleasantness caused in the family by the publicity given it that Beckford was prevailed upon to suppress the work. Only six copies escaped the massacre; it was from the one in the British Museum that G. T. Bettany reprinted the work in the Minerva Series (1891). Beckford and his fair cousin Louisa were kindred spirits; they read together, romped together, and exchanged letters full of gush and high spirits, a number of which can be read in Lewis Melville's biography. But that there was any closer bond between them is plainly contradicted by those letters, in divers of which, and those by no means the least effusive, Beckford reports on the state of his heart towards the young beauty who was soon to be his wife; in short, Louisa, very naturally, becomes the confidante and abettor of his courtship. Of course, there were people who said nasty things at the time about William and Louisa. To chatter of that sort there is allusion in one letter, which clearly gives it the lie. Our French critic, in truth, has no basis but sentimental guesswork and risky deduction for his elaborate superstructure, and the keystone which he has found in the legend is made of stucco. It is all too much like the preposterous tales of Beckford's misogyny and ochlophobia which the present reviewer well remembers circulating in Bath many years ago, among elderly people who had seen the old man riding about the city or on the way between his house and Lansdown, where his tower is still a landmark. M. May adds his contribution to these lurid stories, in his talk about the dwarf at Lansdown Crescent, a poor waif whom Beckford charitably befriended and employed about the house. In his sarcastic way, the old recluse once told a visitor that Piero was a Giaour, and fed upon toadstools—a remark taken very seriously here, in an excursus upon the Giaour in *Vathek*.

Beckford, however, was no Byron, and there is no need to invent mysterious crimes or haunting remorse to make him impressive. He was possibly a more unqualified egoist, but certainly a less theatrical one, and cared nothing for the impression that he made on the public. Born earlier than any of the leaders of the Romantic movement, and outliving most of them, he was in many ways a more incredible type of romanticism than they would have dared to depict.



And yet his sense of humour and his fundamental sanity saved him from anything approaching monomania ; and M. May, in his sketch of the last phase, might reasonably have quoted Alfred de Vigny's saying : " Une belle vie, c'est une pensée de la jeunesse réalisée dans l'âge mûr." For Beckford relieved himself of his Faustian daydreams in *Vathek*, but continued to pursue his real ambition, not without success, for he died happy. Such a life, such a personality, make a rare masterpiece, a rarer one than *Vathek*. It is the classic example in the modern age of egoism carried to the fullest extreme of mundane realisation. Was such a life lived altogether in vain ?

M. May's conclusions may now be guessed. Fielding said ironically of Colley Cibber that perhaps he lived that remarkable life of his in order to write it. M. May would say that nearly everything in Beckford's early life was a preparation for *Vathek*. Obviously, he drew from himself in the overweening hero, whose unholy quest is an allegory of his own furious craving for the unattainable. M. May, further, points out rightly that there is more than one reflex of Beckford in the tale. The caliph with his unscrupulous and insatiable ambition typifies his exorbitant egoism and boundless curiosity ; the amiable Gulchenrouz mirrors the easy-going, epicurean side of Beckford's nature. But the infernal potentate Eblis, and the tortured Solomon, brooding over the annihilation of his earthly grandeur, are likewise drawn from the future autocrat of Fonthill, so far, that is, as there is anything in *Vathek* that can be called character-drawing at all. Lewis Melville said the female figures had their originals in the domestic establishment at Fonthill. M. May recognises the seducing lineaments of Mrs. Peter Beckford in Nouronihar, and detects further echoes of the supposed *drame passionnel*. He conscientiously works out all the connections with what has gone before, estimates Beckford's indebtedness to Marlowe, Milton, Dante, and Dante's imitator Frezzi, and traces the origin of many striking features in the romance to Herbelot's *Bibliothèque Orientale* and various eastern tales published not long previously.

He is as contemptuous as Lewis Melville of the legend that *Vathek* was commenced and finished in two days and three nights. Possibly, the work was written out in full for the first time at a single sitting. But there are evidences of a long incubation, and of many debates with the Rev. Samuel Henley, to whom the English translation was due, on certain oriental features. It is well known how

Henley stole a march on Beckford by publishing *Vathek* in English before the author was prepared to bring it out in the original French. Beckford was not only wroth, but also anxious to recover the MS. Possibly he never did recover it, and in his haste to counteract the results of Henley's misdeed employed some hack writer to translate the English version back into French. Such, M. May supposes, was the genesis of the first extant French text, that of the Lausanne edition. But, to his disgust, the irate author found this replete with blunders and solecisms, and had no alternative, in the absence of the original MS., but to go carefully over this slovenly version correcting errors and polishing up the style. By a collation of numerous passages from the three editions, set out in parallel columns, M. May makes out a case for his theory.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

**A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800.** By R. S. CRANE and F. B. KAYE, with the assistance of M. E. PRIOR.<sup>1</sup> Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. 205. 14s. net.

THERE is no need to enlarge upon the value of periodicals, especially newspapers, to the literary student; the difficulty is to find them. This difficulty Professors Crane and Kaye, whose works are not unknown to the readers of this Review, have sought to remove. They have compiled two separate lists of all the recognised types of periodical publications, except almanacs and calendars, published in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and the Channel Islands from 1620 to 1800. The first list gives the exact holdings of the leading American libraries, including some private collections, of each periodical; the second consists of periodicals not found by the compilers in these libraries. Obviously the first list will be exceedingly useful not only to Americans, but to researchers on this side of the Atlantic; both lists will doubtless enable American libraries to supply their deficiencies.

<sup>1</sup> This work is apparently a separate issue of *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1927.

Apart from its chief purpose as a finding-list, the book has a value as a catalogue. The following is a typical entry :

844. Student ; or, The Oxford monthly miscellany. *Continued as Student ; or, The Oxford and Cambridge monthly miscellany* (from no. 6). Oxford, 1750-51. m. CtY, DLC, IU, MB, MH, NN, NNC, RPB (v. 2, 1751), Tx AG (v. 1, 1750).

(The symbols indicate the various libraries.)

The compilers have added two indexes, the one chronological, the other geographical ; these enable us to discover what periodicals were published in any given year or town. The first index reveals the fall in production after the excitements of the Civil War and the exiguous output during the Restoration, which reached its nadir in 1671-2, when only three periodicals appeared, the *Catalogue of books printed and published at London*, the *London Gazette*, and the *Philosophical Transactions*. The question requires a fuller examination than I am here able to give it, but it appears from this index that the imposition of the Stamp Duty on August 1, 1712, did not cause such a heavy "fall of the leaf" as is generally supposed ; the number of periodicals for the whole kingdom in 1709 was 50, in 1710, 53 ; in 1711, 65 ; in 1712, 51 ; in 1713, 45 ; there was an immediate recovery to 54 in 1714, since which date there has been no falling back. The editors state that "this bibliography is to be looked upon as a first draft," and appeal for corrections and additions. I therefore submit to their consideration a few notes which I have made in turning over its leaves.

P. 15, the "Anti-Jacobin review and magazine" was edited by John Gifford. P. 18, the "Bibliotheca literaria" was edited by Sam. Jebb (not Webb, as here stated) and J. Wasse (of whom Bentley is reported to have said, "When I am dead, Wasse will be the most learned man in England"). P. 22, I doubt if the A.L.A., whose cataloguing rules have been adopted, would sanction "Carlton house magazine." P. 24, the "Christian's magazine" was one of the many works of Dr. Dodd. P. 43, the sub-title of the "Gentleman's magazine" for 1732-5 was "or Trader's Monthly Intelligencer." The entry, p. 128, of the "Dumfries mercury" under the spelling "Drumfries" can perhaps be defended, but we should never think of looking for it there. The provincial papers, which are as we should expect, freely represented in the second list, have caused some trouble : No. 1208c "Dublin chronicle, Dublin, v. 3, no. 204, Oct. 7, 1762" is clearly identical with No. 1434 "Hunter's Dublin chronicle" to which the same date is given ; similarly, Nos. 1347 and 1515a, "General advertiser . . . Liverpool, v. 12, 1777+" and "Liverpool general advertiser, Liverpool, 1765-92 (?) " are related. P. 137, the "General review

of foreign literature, 1775 " was conducted " By a Society of Gentleman of the University of Oxford." P. 160, one of the three known sets of the " Original London post," in which *Robinson Crusoe* appeared as a serial, is in the collection of Mr. A. E. Newton of Philadelphia. P. 171, the " Tatler revived " ran from Monday 16 Oct. 1727 to Monday 15 Jan. 1728 and was " By Isaac Bickerstaff Esq." P. 173, the entry " Universal chronicle; or, Weekly gazette. John Newbery. 1758-60 " is unsatisfactory. This periodical, to the second number of which it will be remembered Johnson contributed his first *Idler*, was originally published by John Payne with the above title; the fifth number, 6 May 1758, was styled " Payne's Universal Chronicle, or Weekly Gazette." This title was retained until 6 Jan. 1759, when Payne's name was dropped and the paper was published by R. Stevens; a year later, 5 Jan. 1760, the title was again changed to " Universal Chronicle and Westminster Journal," when it was printed for W. Faden and R. Stevens; Faden ceased to share in the venture on 8 March. Newbery, so far as I know, never had anything to do with it.

Francis Grose's *Olio*, 1792, which is surely in every American library, is not a periodical, and I very much doubt whether some of the other pieces entered are properly qualified for admission, e.g. " A Spy upon the Spectator," Part 1 of which was published by Morphew in 1711.

There are not, I believe, many omissions. I note the following of which I have records only: the " Express or Evening Gazette " (*Daily Gazetteer*, 12 May 1743); the " Lady's Museum " edited by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox (*Public Ledger*, 21 February 1760, and C. Welsh's *Bookseller of the Last Century*, 1888); and the " Trader's Magazine " (*London Chronicle*, January 1775).

When the editors produce the second edition it is to be hoped that they will include a list of the " ghosts " they have laid.

L. F. POWELL.

**An Early Norse Reader.** Edited by G. N. GARMONSWAY.  
Cambridge: at the University Press. 1928. Pp. xi+148.  
Price 8s. 6d. net.

If output of text-books be a trustworthy index, there is a growing interest in Old Norse studies in England at the present time. After having been long limited to Dr. Sweet's little *Primer* and Vigfusson and Powell's *Reader*, the English student who now wishes to study

Icelandic has at his disposal Sir W. A. Craigie's *Easy Readings in Old Icelandic* (Edinburgh, 1924, price 2s. 6d.)—a book which is a marvel of cheapness and selection; Prof. E. V. Gordon's *Introduction to Old Norse* (Oxford, 1927, price 10s. 6d.)—a more ambitious book, which offers the student in a compact, scholarly and most attractive form sufficient material to carry him far in the study of the Norse languages and literature; and Miss Buckhurst's very practical *Elementary Grammar of Old Icelandic* (London 1925). To these we must now add Mr. Garmonsway's *Early Norse Reader*.

Mr. Garmonsway's most serious competitor will doubtless be Prof. Gordon's book which is planned on a bigger scale, and at a slight additional cost provides a complete introduction to the study not only of Early Norse prose and poetry, but also of Norse and English philology, including the early inscriptions.

Mr. Garmonsway's scope is narrower. Like Sir W. A. Craigie, he aims at enabling the student to read Early Norse in the original, and his book is admirably adapted to fulfil its purpose. Beginning with a brief introduction, it contains a concise grammar (or rather accidence) followed by about sixty pages of carefully selected texts (mainly prose), notes and glossary. The student who works through the texts will have a good grip of Icelandic grammar and a clear picture of the conditions of life in the Viking Age, the literary qualities of the Sagas and the conditions under which they were composed. In addition to more familiar stories like those of Egill Skallagrímson at York, Norna Gest, Auðr the Deepminded, and the fine story of "Þíprandi whom the Goddesses slew," we have illuminating extracts such as that on "Early Church Building" from the *Eyrbyggja Saga*, in which we are informed that what "encouraged men much to church building was the promise of the clergy that a man should have at his disposal in the kingdom of heaven space for as many men as could stand in the church which he had built," or the extracts from Snorri Sturluson and the *Haralds saga Harðrada* which show us how Icelanders collected material for their sagas. Another useful and uncommon selection is that from the *Grágás*.

The notes explain most of the serious grammatical difficulties, but we miss an index of proper-names with explanations and references. The beginner will find the references to translations useful.

I add a few notes, some of which may be worthy of the editor's

consideration. Norse was spoken in some parts of Scotland down to the seventeenth century, and in Man until the fifteenth century (p. 2). Is it not putting it too strong to say that "what is commonly called Norwegian is *merely* Danish, and it is in this language that almost the whole of modern Norwegian literature is written" (p. 2)? Nominative plurals like *menn*, *negl* hardly come under the rule given in § 10 (*d*), and 10 (*h*) might be put more clearly. The genitive of *vik*, the model for Type V is normally *vikr*, see Noreen § 407 and Zoega. Under *hlutr* in the Glossary the phrase *hinn efra hlut dagsins* "at the end of the day" might be given. It does not seem at all likely that "Heimdallr was one of the race of the Vanir" (41, 61, note). He was the guardian of heaven among the Æsir (see E. Mogk, *s.v. Heimdallr* in Hoops). A parallel for the meaning of the line

vissi hann vel fram sem Vanir aðrir

may perhaps be found in

Lagon þa oðre fynd on þam fyre (*Genesis* B. 322),

where the meaning is "the others, the devils, lay in the fire."

S. J. CRAWFORD.

### Some Important Points in Historical English Grammar.

By R. D—N. SOMERSET. Basil Blackwell: Oxford. 1928. Pp. 39. 3s. net.

THIS summary of "elementary facts in Historical English Grammar" should prove a useful little handbook for students. One would be inclined, however, to recommend its use *after* that of "more advanced works" rather than *before* as the preface advocates.

It could be utilised to best purpose as an aid to clarifying and reducing within comprehensible limits the mass of material involved in even an undergraduate course of Historical Grammar, but the, to some extent, unavoidable vagueness of the chronology and the resulting confusion between the periods might well be misleading to a student who had not previously dealt more precisely with the subject.

One might further disagree with a number of the author's statements, as, for example, that the OE. *ciele* illustrates diphthongisation of *e* to *ie* by the initial palatal *c*, or that OE. *hīeran* develops to the



ME. *hēren*, or that OE. *c* is written *k* initially *before consonants* in ME., etc.

But if the execution is here and there open to criticism, the conception of the work is admirable, and the average undergraduate student would certainly benefit considerably by its inclusion among his text-books.

E. G. INGRAM.

**An Elementary Middle-English Grammar (Second Edition).**

By JOSEPH WRIGHT, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., D.Litt., etc., and ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. xiv + 226. 7s. net.

THE second edition of this well-established Middle-English Grammar improves on the first mainly in its more comprehensive treatment of the Middle English strong verb, the additional material in this connection relating for the most part to the ousting of the old strong preterite type by new weak formations—a widely important tendency ignored in the previous edition.

In the chapter on the vowels of accented syllables some useful new material has also been included, notably in the direction of carrying on certain vowel developments into the fifteenth century and of adducing North- and South-West Midland dialectal variants more freely.

Elsewhere the author has merely introduced a few additional examples, or in one or two instances corrected certain minor misstatements or errors of classification allowed to stand in the first edition.

Since this grammar, in its general scope and treatment, is perhaps better suited than any other to the needs of the undergraduate student of Middle English, this new and expanded edition is especially welcome.

E. G. INGRAM.

**The Shakespeare Mystery.** By GEORGE CONNES. Abridged and translated into English by a Member of the Shakespeare Fellowship. Cecil Palmer. 1927. Pp. 287. 7s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR CONNES' intention is to give a summary of the views of those who refuse to believe that Shakespeare wrote the plays and

poems which bear his name. If well done such a survey would have its value, but unfortunately Prof. Connes has written a "popular" and highly coloured book which is of very little use to students. It has neither index nor references, and is based apparently on second or even third-hand knowledge of the essential facts. There is plenty of (undocumented) scandal about Queen Elizabeth and a romantic imaginary peep at Tudor London, where "everyone's hand is on his sword hilt. At daybreak, the dead bodies of the slain are removed by the watch with no particular feeling, as they say to each other, 'They've been at it again.'" Perhaps, however, the professor does establish one conclusion—that the late Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of William Shakespeare* is the anti-Stratfordians' best asset.

G. B. H.

**Robert Eyres Landor.** A Biographical and Critical Sketch.  
By ERIC PARTRIDGE. The Fanfrolico Press, London, W.C.  
1927. 10s. 6d. net.

**Selections from Robert Landor.** Edited by ERIC PARTRIDGE.  
London: The Fanfrolico Press. 1927. 7s. 6d. net.

THESE two volumes are the forerunners of a promised complete edition of Robert Eyres Landor. The biography—wrongly described on the jacket as edited by Mr. Partridge—is written with generous even if slightly indiscriminating enthusiasm, and contains valuable bibliographical information. The poetical selections, including the extracts from the plays, are hardly just, since they give an impression of little more than skill in handling stately rhetorical verse, and Mr. Partridge's summaries even emphasise the disjointed and uneasy romanticism of Landor's dramatic work. The prose extracts, on the other hand, especially the ironical passages from *The Fountain of Arethusa* and the Letters to *The Courier*, are admirably chosen, both for their own worth and for bringing out the lofty temper and sensitive integrity of their writer. Robert Landor is in no way a pale shadow of his brother Walter, but it is in his prose and in his personal character, there revealed most clearly, that he best endures the inevitable comparison.

EDITH C. BATHO.

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Vol. LII. (Neue Folge XL.), January 1929—  
 Darstellung und kritische Würdigung der Sprachphilosophie John  
 Lockes (Arthur Zobel), pp. 289-324.  
 Chaucers angebliche Übersetzung des Traktates *De Contemptu Mundi*  
 von Innocenz III. (Viktor Langhans), pp. 325-49.  
 Zu den Sprichwörtern Hending's (G. Schleich), pp. 350-61.  
 Welchen Dialekt spricht Hamlet? (Wilhelm Marschall), pp. 362-72.  
 Five Notes on *Hamlet* (Samuel A. Tannenbaum), pp. 373-81.  
 Der Versrhythmus in *King Horn* (E. W. Scripture), pp. 382-84.
- BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. V., December 1928—  
 Samuel Johnson: An Early "Friend of the Bodleian" (L. F. Powell),  
 pp. 280-81.  
 Gift of Erse books.
- BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. 13,  
 January 1929—  
 The Working Man in Literature (H. W. C. Davis), pp. 6-8.  
 A Further Note on the Fictitious Bunyan Books (J. Rendel Harris),  
 pp. 123-27.
- CORNHILL MAGAZINE, December 1928—  
 Shaw: the Later Plays (H. C. Duffin), pp. 672-80.  
 Consideration of Shaw's philosophy.
- ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 63, January 1929—  
 Das zweite Hirtenspiel der Wakefielder Spiele (übersetzt von F. Holt-  
 hausen), pp. 193-219.  
 Translation and notes.  
 Textual Notes on the Towneley Old Testament Plays (P. E. Dustoor),  
 pp. 220-28.  
 The Medial Development of M.E.  $\delta_1$  (tense), Fr.  $\ddot{u}$  ( $=[\bar{y}]$ ) and M.E. *eu*  
 (O.E. *ēow*) in the Dialects of the North of England (Harold Orton),  
 pp. 229-51.  
 Das melanesische Pidjin-English (H. Nevermann), pp. 252-58.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 249

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. X., December 1928—

The Taming of the Shrew (B. A. P. van Dam), pp. 161-77.

—Vol. XI., February 1929—

The Conversion of the Indirect Personal Object into the Subject of a Passive Construction (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 1-11.

Contributions to English Syntax (E. Kruisinga), pp. 17-20.

On Syntactic Groups with the Auxiliary *to have*.

La Belle Dame sans Merci (B. J. Timmer), pp. 20-22.

Note on Chaucer's *Complaint to his Lady*, l. 31.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. 154 (New Series, Vol. 54), December 1928—

Untersuchungen zur historischen englischen Syntax (Wilhelm Horn), pp. 213-23.

Die Bedeutung des ne. Ortsnamen *Arrallas* (Max Förster), pp. 273-74.

Die Kinder des Macbeth (Wilhelm Horn), pp. 275-76.

Gandhi und Shelley, zwei Idealisten der Revolution (Helene Richter), pp. 277-80.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVII., October 1928—

The Meaning of Chaucer's *House of Fame* (Frederick C. Riedel), pp. 441-69.

A covert attack upon John of Gaunt?

The Development of Bacon's Essays—With Special Reference to the Question of Montaigne's Influence Upon Them (Jacob Zeitlin), pp. 496-519.

Albrecht von Haller and Samuel Clarke (Lura M. Teeter), pp. 520-23.

LIBRARY, Vol. IX., December 1928—

Some Aspects of Sheridan Bibliography (R. Crompton Rhodes), pp. 233-61.

Dramatic piracy in the later eighteenth century.

An Interruption in the Printing of the First Folio (E. E. Willoughby), pp. 262-66.

Evidence of damaged tailpiece.

*Troilus and Cressida*, 1609 (Peter Alexander), pp. 267-86.

*Eastward Ho*, 1605. By Chapman, Jonson and Marston. Bibliography and Circumstances of Production (R. E. Brettle), pp. 287-302.

Note by W. W. Greg, pp. 303-04.

Further Notes on Shakespeare's Sonnets (J. A. Fort), pp. 305-25.

Caxton's Son-in-Law (Frank Marcham, W. J. Blyth Crotch, and A. W. P.), pp. 325-26.

LIFE AND LETTERS, Vol. I., December 1928—

George Herbert (F. L. Lucas), pp. 548-61.

———Vol. II., January 1929—

Dr. James's Powder (Bruce Dickins), pp. 36-47.

"A footnote to eighteenth-century literature."

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XIX., December 1928—

Oliver Goldsmith (A. L. Irvine), pp. 166-75.

———January 1929—

Last Essays: Matthew Arnold (C. E. Montague), pp. 278-84.

———February 1929—

Keats, Reynolds, and *The Champion* (John M. Turnbull), pp. 384-94.

MASK, Vol. XIV., October-December 1928—

The Library of a Comedian; J. P. Harley, 1786-1858 (Paul McPharlin), pp. 154-61.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLIII., November 1928—

Voltaire's Marginal Comments upon Pope's *Essay on Man* (G. R. Havens), pp. 429-39.

L.-S. Mercier et l'*Elegy* de Gray (E. Rovillain), pp. 442-45.

Browning's First Mention of the Documentary Sources of *The Ring and the Book* (W. O. Raymond), pp. 445-50.

*The Grand Signiors Serraglio*: Written by Master Robert Withers (W. G. Rice), pp. 450-59.

The First English Translator of *Werther*—A Correction (Alan D. McKillop), p. 467.

———December—

Some Recent Linguistic Studies (Kemp Malone), pp. 499-511.

A Note on Burns's Language (F. B. Snyder), pp. 511-18.

John Skelton and Christopher Garnesche (Helen Stearns), pp. 518-23.

O.E. *mæ3eþ* in *Hali Meidenhad* (W. F. Fogg), 527-29.

An Irish Parallel to the Broken Sword of the Grail Castle (W. Pennington), pp. 534-36.

An Holy Jewes Shepe (G. M. Rutter), p. 536.

Note on Chaucer's *Prologue*, 351.

Jefferson and Ossian (A. L. Hench), p. 537.

Note on Lyly's *Euphues* (W. P. Mustard), p. 537.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXIV., January 1929—

Further Borrowings from *Ancren Riwle* (Hope Emily Allen), pp. 1-15.

*Beowulf*, ll. 848 ff. (E. E. Wardale), pp. 62-63.

Grendel's Descent from Cain (S. J. Crawford), p. 63.

Reference in the *Lebhar Na Huidre*.

The Poems of Chidiok Tichbourne (1558-1586) (H. J. L. Robbie), pp. 64-66.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVI., November 1928—

Is Shakespeare's Antonio the "Weeping Philosopher" Heraclitus? (George C. Taylor), pp. 161-67.

The Transcendentalism of William Wordsworth (Melvin Rader), pp. 169-90.

The Canon of Peele's Works (T. Larsen), pp. 191-99.

Coleridge's Intimations of Immortality from Proclus (John D. Rea), pp. 201-13.

The genesis of Wordsworth's *Ode*.

Documents and Records (Florence E. White), pp. 249-55.

Chaucer's Shipman: the case of *John de Roches v. John Hawley*.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XIV., January 1929—

Over de Shylockfiguur, I. (R. Volbeda), pp. 120-26.

Wuthering Heights (M. Polak), pp. 126-29.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CIV., December 1928—

Robert Poley: an Associate of Marlowe (F. S. Boas), p. 850.

A Correction.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 155, November 10, 1928—

*The Critics* (James J. Gorham), p. 339.

Further bibliographical details.

—November 16—

The Baptism of Charles Dickens (W. Courthope Forman), pp. 345-46.

Note by Edward Bensly, December 1, p. 393.

—December 1—

Wordsworth and Letitia E. Landon (T. O. Mabbott), p. 381.

Mrs. Browning's Translations of the *Odyssey* (C. T. O.), p. 391.

Meaning of "alate" (Od. xx. 77).

—December 8—

The Authorship of *Lust's Dominion* (S. R. Golding), pp. 399-402.

—December 15—

Du Bellay and Shakespeare (H. Gordon Ward), p. 417.

*Petronilla Puellæ* and Queen Gertrude's lament over Ophelia.



## NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 155, December 22, 1928—

*The Forest Lovers* : A Letter of Hewlett's Concerning his Romance  
(W. Courthope Forman), p. 435.

Changes in the Text of Horne's *Orion* (T. O. Mabbott), pp. 441-42.

—December 29—

Izaak Walton (W. Courthope Forman), p. 465.  
Evidence that he was an ironmonger.

—Vol. 156, January 26, 1929—

Geoffrey of Monmouth's Presentation of the Legend of the Trojans  
in Britain (A. Anscombe), pp. 62-64.

"Pickwick" in the Circus (J. M. Bulloch), p. 64.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., January 1929—

Collaboration in Elizabethan Drama : Mr. W. J. Lawrence's Theory  
(E. H. C. Oliphant), pp. 1-10.

Marlowe and Elizabethan Psychology (Carroll Camden, Jr.), pp. 69-78.  
Zeugma in Vergil's *Aeneid* and in English.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
Vol. XLIII., September 1928—

Das Schwache Präteritum als Mischbildung (Hermann Collitz),  
pp. 593-601.

A Source for Spenser's Story of Timias and Belphebe (Clara W.  
Crane), pp. 635-44.

Arthur Gorges, Spenser's Alcyon and Raleigh's Friend (Helen E.  
Sandison), pp. 645-74.

Spenser and Bruno (Ronald B. Levinson), pp. 675-81.

Some Observations on Christopher Marlowe, Government Agent  
(Austin K. Gray), pp. 682-700.

Shakespeare's Purpose in *Timon of Athens* (Dixon Wecter), pp. 701-21.  
A vindication of Essex?

The Folio Version of *Henry V.* in relation to Shakespeare's Times  
(Evelyn M. Albright), pp. 722-56.  
Text intended for a special performance?

"My Jewish Gaberdine" (M. Channing Linthicum), pp. 757-66.

More About *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* (S. A. Tannenbaum),  
pp. 767-78.

Thomas Heywood and *The Life and Death of Hector* (Charles A. Rouse),  
pp. 779-83.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

Campion's *Art of English Poesie* and Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside* (Elisabeth L. Buckingham), pp. 784-92.

The Authorship of *Anything for a Quiet Life* (W. D. Dunkel), pp. 793-99.

Thomas Pandolph and *The Drinking Academy* (Cyrus L. Day), pp. 800-09.

Melodrama and Tragedy (Alan R. Thompson), pp. 810-35.

Voltaire and Peter Annet's *Life of David* (Norman L. Torrey), pp. 836-43.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLIII., December 1928—

Bodmer and Milton once More (C. H. Ibershoff), 1055-61.

Classical Allusions in the Poetry of Donne (Beatrice Johnson), pp. 1098-109.

Cancelled Passages in the Letters of Robert Burns to George Thomson (J. DeLancey Ferguson), pp. 1110-20.

Blake and Thomas Taylor (Frederick E. Pierce), pp. 1121-41.

Heresy concerning Keats (Royall Snow), pp. 1142-49.  
On the *Ode on a Grecian Urn*.

Carlyle's General Method in *The French Revolution* (C. F. Harrold), pp. 1150-69.

Spectral Etching in the Poetry of Thomas Hardy (G. R. Elliott), pp. 1185-95.

The Accuracy of the B-Scribe of *Beowulf* (J. R. Hulbert), pp. 1196-99.

The Date and Occasion of Waller's *Panegyric to my Lord Protector* (Ella T. Riske), pp. 1201-02.

## REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAIN, Vol. VI., December 1928—

John Milton : l'homme et le poète (fin) (H. J. C. Grierson), pp. 97-114.

Edouard Dowden (C. M. Garnier), pp. 115-130.

La jeune poésie irlandaise (fin) (Alfred R. Péron), pp. 155-69.

## SHAKESPEARE JAHRBUCH. Hgg. von Wolfgang Keller, Vol. 64 (New Series 5), 1928—

Shakespeares Einfluss auf die Musik (H. von Waltershausen), pp. 13-42.

Zum Aufbau des Shakespeareschen Erlebnisses (W. Linden), pp. 43-62.

Die Dämonologie in Shakespeares "Macbeth" : Die Hexen (G. von Glasenapp), pp. 63-76.

Der "Sturm" als Operntext bearbeitet von Einsiedel und Gotter (W. Deetjen), pp. 77-89.

Der Selbstmord bei Shakespeare (H. Daffner), pp. 90-131.

Zur Beurteilung der Darmstädter Shakespeare-Maske (E. Gundolf), pp. 132-40.

Juan Timoneda und das Imogen-Portia-Motiv. (Elise Richter), pp. 141-58.

Christopher Marlowe: Seine Persönlichkeit und sein Schaffen (J. Schick), pp. 159-79.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVI., January 1929—

Wordsworth in America (Norman Foerster), pp. 85-95.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, October 11, 1928—

Coleridge and the "Forty Youths of Bristol" (J. L. Lowes), p. 736.

Early contemporary appreciations of Southey and Coleridge. Notes by Bertram R. Davis and Winifred Parry, October 18, p. 759.

Shakespeare's "Purge" of Jonson (M. P. Tilley), p. 736.

—October 18—

Sir William Killigrew's *The Siege of Urbin* (W. J. Lawrence), p. 755.

Two Burns Relics (R. Dewar), p. 783.

Burns' copies of *A Select Collection of English Songs*, Vol. II, and of Oswald's *Caledonian Pocket Companion*. Reply by Davidson Cook, November 8, p. 834.

—November 1—

A Debt of Sterne's (Edward Bensly), p. 806.

To Ephraim Chambers' *Cyclopædia*.

*The Siege of Urbin* (Bernard M. Wagner), p. 806.

Notes on the Bodleian MS.

The Text of *Hamlet*, i. ii. 129 (J. Dover Wilson), p. 806.

Replies by Mark Hunter, November 15, p. 859; Wilhelm Marschall, November 22, p. 910; Marshall Montgomery, November 29, p. 938.

*The British Princes* (Percival Serle), p. 806.

Bibliographical note on edition of 1669.

—November 8—

Act and Chorus in *Henry V* (C. Endymion Porter), pp. 833-34.

Reply by William Poel, November 15, p. 859.

Mystery as a Term of Art (Frank Granger), p. 834.

Reply by H. W. Fowler, November 15, p. 859.

An Alleged Holograph of Gray (Paget Toynbee), p. 834.

The Daniel MS. of *The Progress of Poesy*. Note on other alleged autographs by Leonard Whibley, November 15, p. 859.

Tottel's Miscellany and Wyatt (A. P. Rossiter), p. 834.

Alterations in Wyatt's text.

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

## TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 15, 1928—

Shakespeare's Fellows (G. E. Bentley), p. 856.

References in records preserved at St. Saviour's, Southwark.

W. P. Ker and the "Ormulum" (R. W. Chambers), p. 859.

A Poem by Coleridge (W. J. B. Pienaar), p. 859.

From the Cape of Good Hope Literary Gazette, January 1834.

Note by H. Milford, December 6, p. 966.

## —November 22—

Wycliffe, commonly known as "Wyk" (H. W. Garrod), p. 909.

References in Merton College documents.

"That two-handed engine at the door" (K. N. Colville), pp. 909-10.

Reply by Nowell Smith, December 6, p. 965.

Richard Rolle (Hope Emily Allen), p. 910.

Errata in Miss Allen's study of Rolle.

## —November 29—

The Mortal Moon (G. B. Harrison), p. 938.

Reference in Shakespeare's Sonnet 107 to Elizabeth's Climacteric.

Two Johnson Items (Aleyn L. Reade), p. 938.

## —December 6—

A New Fragment of Mum and Soothsegger (Robert Steele), p. 965.

A Lost Poem by Collins (Alan D. McKillop), p. 965.

*An Epistle to the Editor of Fairfax his Translation of Tasso.* Note by A. S. P. Woodhouse, January 24, p. 62.

Christian IV. and *Hamlet* (George Young), p. 965.

*The Dumb Band of Venice* (G. E. Bentley), p. 966.

A lost play of 1628?

## —December 13—

Mr. T. S. Eliot and Shelley's *Skylark* (T. Sturge Moore), p. 991.

Reply by A. E. H., December 20, p. 1011; by T. Sturge Moore, January 3, p. 12; by Morton Luce, January 17, p. 44.

Landor: Lines on Trelawney (H. S. Milford), p. 991.

Dr. Johnson and Dr. James (R. W. Chapman), p. 991.

Johnson's share in James' Medicinal Dictionary. Replies by S. M. Ellis December 20, p. 1011; and L. F. Powell, January 3, p. 12.

## —December 20—

Collins and Martin Martin (A. S. P. Woodhouse), p. 1011.

A third source for the *Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands*. Further note by W. C. Mackenzie, January 10, p. 28; and A. S. P. Woodhouse, January 24, p. 62.

## —December 27—

"My wealthy Andrew" (Ernest Kuhl), p. 1025.

Andrew as the name of a ship.

Uncollected Verse by John Dryden (Roswell G. Ham), p. 1025.  
Prologues and Epilogues.

English River Names (W. H. B. Bird and C. R. Enock), p. 1025.  
*Granta*; *Thames*. Note by A. C. Moule, January 24, p. 62; reply by  
W. H. B. Bird, January 31, p. 80.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 3, 1929—

Harington and Jaques (B. H. Newdigate), p. 12.

Further note, January 10, p. 28.

—January 10—

The Bicentenary of Burke, pp. 17-18.

An Unpublished Letter of Burke's (Andrew Tomlinson), p. 28.

To M. de Calonne, October 25, 1790. Note on Calonne's reply by J. W.  
Fitzwilliam, January 17, p. 44.

The Letters of Sir Walter Scott (Constable & Co., Limited), p. 28.

A Sentence of *Gulliver's Travels* in Swift's Hand (Harold Williams),  
p. 28.

Evidence of Swift's interest in Faulkner's edition, 1735.

—January 17—

William Congreve, pp. 33-34.

Shakespeare and Bergson (G. Wilson Knight), p. 44.

Touchstone's "Dial" (R. T. Gunther), p. 44.

—January 24—

Queen Elizabeth and Essex in English and Foreign Drama (Ernest  
Lesser), p. 62.

Further notes by Dixon Wecter, J. B. Trend and William Poel, January 31,  
p. 80.

The Date of Christopher Smart's Confinement (C. D. Abbott),  
p. 62.

Thomas Warton and the *Ode to Horror* (A. S. P. Woodhouse), p. 62.

Time's Whirligig (R. W. Chapman), p. 62.

Suppressed passage in a letter from Johnson to Mrs. Thrale.

—January 31—

James Thomson's *Socrates* (E. L. Allhusen), p. 80.

25.

25.

reply by

3.

y by J. W.

, p. 28.

(Williams),

IN

an

ca

an

we

bu

ca

an

wa

For

the

he

pr

tic

For

the

pe

for

w

tr

Q

f

na (Ernest

January 31,

Abbott),

), p. 62.

ed,